Supplemental Narrative Description of Outcomes
PART 1: PROMPTING PROCEDURE COMPARISONS

	First Author	Narrative Description of Results
Single Prompt Comparisons	T1: Ault, 1988 T1: Shook T2: Head T2: Schuster T3: Singleton	*Type 1: Constant versus progressive time delay.* In 7 comparisons, participants learned faster via CTD; in 2 comparisons, participants learned faster with PTD; in 5 comparisons, data were undifferentiated. *Type 2: CTD vs. simultaneous prompting.* In 7 comparisons, participants learned faster via SP; in 5 comparisons, participants learned faster with CTD; in 12 comparisons, data were undifferentiated. *Type 3: SP vs. antecedent prompt and test.* In 11 comparisons, participants learned faster with APT; in one comparison, data were undifferentiated.
Hierarchical Comparisons	Cengher Leaf, 2016a	In 5 comparisons, participants learned faster with most-to-least prompts compared to procedures that increase or reduce prompt intrusiveness based on within-session responding (SLP, FPF); in 4 comparisons, participants learned faster with SLP or FPF; in 5 comparisons, data were undifferentiated.
Single Prompt vs. Hierarchical	Bennett Boulware Boutain Godby	In 11 comparisons, participants learned faster with single prompt procedures; in 3 comparisons, participants learned faster with hierarchical prompt procedures; in 17 comparisons, data were undifferentiated.
Errorless vs. Error Correction	Gorgan Leaf, 2010 Leaf, 2014 Leaf, 2016c	In 13 comparisons, participants learned faster with error correction; in 4, participants learned faster with errorless instruction; in 13, data were undifferentiated.

Supplemental Narrative Description of Outcomes
PART 2: ANTECEDENT VARIATIONS

	First Author	Narrative Description of Results
Extra verbal information	Humphreys	In one comparison each, participants acquired skills faster or slower when extra verbal information was included in prompt. In 3 comparisons, data were undifferentiated.
Extra visual	Pufpaff	For all participants, visual information in form of superimposed images resulted in slower acquisition of reading words.

Supplemental Narrative Description of Outcomes
PART 3: CONSEQUENCE VARIATIONS

	First Author	Narrative Description of Results
Instructive Feedback (IF)	Apple Reichow	In 5 comparisons, participants learned faster when IF was provided; in 2 comparisons, participants learned faster when it was not provided; in 5 comparisons, data were undifferentiated.
Reward Procedures	T1: Harrell T2: Majdalany, 2016 T3: Toussaint	*Type 1: Independent (IC) vs. interdependent contingencies (ITC).* In 3 comparisons, participants acquired skills faster with IC; in 2 comparisons, participants acquired skills faster with ITC; in two, data were undifferentiated. *Type 2: Shorter vs. longer delays to reinforcement.* In 5 comparisons, participants learned faster with shorter delays; in 4 comparisons, results were undifferentiated. *Type 3: Choice of reward vs. no choice.* In 2 comparisons, participants learned faster when choice was provided; in 1 comparison, data were undifferentiated.
Reward Type	T1: Clements T2: Polick	*Type 1: Praise with or without additional rewards.* In 2 comparisons, participants learned faster when praise was paired with other rewards. In 4 comparisons, results were undifferentiated. *Type 2: General vs. Specific praise.* In 4 comparisons, participants learned faster when descriptive praise was provided; in 4 comparisons, data were undifferentiated; in 1 one comparison, a participant learned faster when general praise was provided.
Error Correction (EC) Type	T1: Waugh T2: Carroll, 2013 T3: Carroll, 2013	*Type 1: EC versus none.* In 2 comparisons, participants acquired skills faster when EC was provided; data were undifferentiated for third. *Type 2: Multiple corrections vs. single.* For 6 comparisons, participants acquired skills faster when multiple corrections were provided; for 2, participants acquired skills slower. For 2 comparisons, data were undifferentiated. *Type 3: Model as EC vs. Model + presentation of new trial.* For 14 comparisons, participants acquired skills faster and for 3 acquired skills slower when trial was provided. For 3 comparisons, data were undifferentiated.

Supplemental Narrative Description of Outcomes
PART 4: OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL VARIATIONS

	First Author	Narrative Description of Results
Fidelity	T1: Carroll, 2013 T1: Owsiany, 2013 T2: Carroll, 2013	*Type 1: High (HF) vs. low fidelity (LF)*. In 25 comparisons, participants learned faster when high fidelity instruction was provided; in 7 comparisons, participants learned faster when low fidelity instruction was provided; in 19 comparisons, data were undifferentiated. *Type 2: Different fidelity errors.* In 4 comparisons, LF reinforcement resulted in faster learning than LF prompts (n = 2) or instructions (n = 2). In 2 comparisons, LF instructions resulted in faster learning than LF prompts (n = 1) or reinforcement (n = 1). In 1 comparison, LF prompts resulted in faster learning than LF reinforcement; in 2 comparisons data were undifferentiated.
Frequency	Julien Spino	In one comparison each, participants acquired skills faster or slower when more frequent instruction occurred. In 3 comparisons, data were undifferentiated.
Group Size	Colozzi Hawkins Leaf, 2013	In 14 comparisons, participants learned faster during individual instruction; in 6, participants learned faster during group instruction; in 16, data were undifferentiated.
Prompt Mode	Leaf, 2016b	For 1 comparison, a participant learned faster with indirect rather than direct verbal prompts; for 4 comparisons, data were undifferentiated.
Trial Arrangement	T1: Ledford T1: Majdalany, 2014 T2: George T3: Call	*Type 1: Massed trials versus embedded in play or during the day:* In 5 comparisons, participants learned faster with massed trials; in 3 comparisons, participants learned faster with embedded/distributed trials, and in 3 comparisons, data were undifferentiated. *Type 2: Participate in attending cues for all trials or only individual trials:* In all 6 comparisons, data were undifferentiated. *Type 3: Shorter vs. longer interval between trials.* For 1 comparison, a participant learned faster with a shorter ITI; for 2, data were undifferentiated.
Trial Ordering	Majdalany, 2014	For 4 comparisons, participants learned faster when known (mastered) stimuli were not interspersed with unknown (instructional) stimuli; for 1 comparison, a participant learned faster when unknown stimuli were interspersed; for 1 comparison, data were undifferentiated.