The Acceptability of Behavior Modification in Business

Lynn Elizabeth Gramley

Lycoming College

Running head: ACCEPTABILITY OF BUSINESS BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION

The Acceptability of Behavior Modification in Business

Lynn Elizabeth Gramley

Lycoming

Presented to the Faculty of Lycoming College in partial fulfillment of the requirement for graduation with Departmental Honors in Psychology.

Abstract

The acceptability of behavior modification was evaluated by 79 subjects, 45 female and 34 male. The subjects were psychology and business students and business workers. Using a modified version of the Treatment Evaluation Inventory developed by Kazdin (1980a) and the Semantic Differential scale, subjects rated the acceptability of two of six vignettes one written in organizational behavior modification terminology and one written in humanistic terminology. The results indicated that organizational behavior modification was rated significantly less acceptable than humanistic terminology (.10 significance level). The results support those of earlier research on behavior modification, but more research is needed.

The Acceptability of Behavior Modification in Business

Behavior modification has a wide variety of uses because it deals with modifying human behavior. The use of behavior modification (BMOD) in business is called organizational behavior modification (OBMOD). Behavior modification is in itself a topic of much uncertainty. With psychology's image today, the image of BMOD itself needs to be assessed. Ethical issues are important to both psychology and business because the public will accept what is viewed as ethical. The acceptability of BMOD has been studied although not extensively, and the acceptability of OBMOD has barely been examined. Due to the importance of ethics in business, research on the acceptability of organizational behavior modification is needed.

Because psychology deals with humans, ethics is an important aspect of its image. Therefore, the acceptability and ethics of BMOD affects its image. Several studies have dealt with the acceptability of behavior modification. Miltenberger, Lennox and Erfanian (1989) conducted a study which rated the

acceptability of four BMOD techniques using the Treatment Evaluation Inventory (TEI) because of its extensive use in research on treatment acceptability. The results showed that DRO (differential reinforcement of other behavior) was rated as the most acceptable followed in order by time-out, overcorrection, and contingent shock. From these results, it was implied that less restrictive techniques are rated more acceptable, all techniques are more acceptable when applied to severe problems, and techniques with less side effects are more acceptable. Similar findings were reported by Tingstrom and Silver (1989). Their study also rated the acceptability of certain BMOD techniques by those implementing the techniques (e.g. teachers) and found that DRO was rated as the most acceptable followed by time-out and corporal punishment. Studies such as these have been conducted because of the importance of these techniques being accepted by the public. The more accepted a technique the more it will be used and the better it reflects upon the approach it represents.

It is often felt that it is the terminology of

BMOD as well as the title itself that causes such a negative view of behavior modification. A study by Kazdin and Cole (1981) examined the effects of the label and the terminology of BMOD on it's acceptability. They constructed vignettes written in BMOD conditions using BMOD techniques such as reinforcement, humanistic conditions using humanistic techniques, and neutral conditions not specifying techniques. Subjects read and rated each on the Teacher-Classroom Evaluation Scale and the Semantic Differential scale. Results showed that BMOD vignettes were viewed significantly more negatively than the neutral or humanistic vignettes. BMOD vignettes were rated significantly worse than the neutral vignettes on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, but no significant differences were found on the Potency and Activity subscales of the Semantic Differential scale. They inferred that the content generated the negative evaluations and decided to look closer at this area. They also constructed vignettes utilizing BMOD terminology such as "shaping" and others utilizing ordinary terminology. Again, the subjects

rated the BMOD vignettes significantly more negatively than the ordinary terminology vignettes implying that it may well be the BMOD terminology causing the negative evaluation. Behavior modification was also rated significantly worse on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, but no significant differences were found on the other subscales of Potency and Activity. The acceptability of an approach is very important to its use and to the image of the field that utilizes the approach.

The acceptability of something depends heavily upon its ethical status and ethics in business is very important. Good ethics in business is said to produce peer cooperation, energetic employees and faithful customers while bad ethics is said to produce depressed productivity (Connolly, 1987). It is also important for business to be ethical because a good image can sell products and attract customers and investors even in a time of crisis when often a good image is the only thing that a company may have (D'Alessandro, 1990). Because of the importance of ethics to the image of business and the importance of the image of business to

its success, organizational behavior modification should be the topic of much research.

The acceptability of OBMOD has not been studied much even though it is a very important topic. Davis, Rawana and Capponi (1989) studied the acceptability of BMOD in staff management by staff members by revising Kazdin's TEI scale for their own purposes and using the Semantic Differential scale because with its subscales, it can support the TEI and also point to possible reasons why a certain technique may be viewed as either acceptable or unacceptable. The results showed that instruction was the most acceptable followed in order by modeling, self-management, reinforcement, and punishment with reinforcement being rated significantly better on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, but not better than punishment overall. Other studies on the acceptability of organizational behavior modification are scarce.

Because of the importance of ethics in business, the acceptability of OBMOD is an important topic, yet it is very under-researched. The current study attempts to add to the research on the acceptability of

OBMOD by rating the acceptability of OBMOD as viewed by people in the business setting, business students, and psychology students. Following the research of Kazdin and Cole (1981), the current study rates the acceptability of OBMOD through a comparison of vignettes written in OBMOD terminology and humanistic terminology. It was predicted that vignettes written in organizational behavior modification terminology would be rated as significantly less acceptable than vignettes written in humanistic terminology.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were chosen from business students and psychology students at Lycoming College and from employees at the Sheraton Hotel in Williamsport, Pa.. There were 79 subjects of which 45 were female and 34 were male. There were 19 business workers (8 female, 11 male), 33 business students (15 female, 18 male), and 27 psychology students (22 female, 5 male).

Apparatus

Following Miltenberger, et al. (1989), Kazdin and Cole (1981), and Davis, et al. (1989), the current experiment was conducted utilizing the Semantic Differential scale with its three subscales (Evaluative, Potency, and Activity) (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957) and the Treatment Evaluation Inventory which consists of 16 items in a Likert-type format on a 1-7 point scale. The TEI was developed by Kazdin (1980a) and was chosen for this particular study because of it's extensive use in acceptability research and the fact that it has been analyzed and tested for reliability and validity (Kazdin, 1980b). The items on

the TEI were evaluated by Kazdin in a pilot study with 60 students in which the students also rated 15 Semantic Differential adjectives. The Semantic Differential was used (see Appendix A) because it would increase the number of factors and it was hoped that its Evaluative subscale would support the TEI. The purpose of Kazdin's pilot study was to evaluate the TEI items. After being subjected to factor analysis, one item was dropped leaving 15 items which were found to be reliable and were also able to be supported by the Evaluative scale of the Semantic Differential scale (Kazdin, 1980b). Kazdin administered the TEI again to 144 college students and support for the TEI items was found a second time (Kazdin, 1980b). In the current study, the TEI was modified (see Appendix B) to suit the purpose of assessing OBMOD rather than BMOD and consisted of 14 questions (one was dropped due to its lack of relevance).

The experiment also utilized 6 vignettes constructed by the experimenter which described three different scenarios each written once in OBMOD terminology and once in humanistic terminology (see

Appendix C).

Packets were constructed so that each contained an OBMOD vignette followed by a copy of the TEI and Semantic Differential scales and a copy of a humanistic vignette also followed by a copy of the TEI and Semantic Differential scales. In addition, demographic information (eg. the number of psychology and business courses taken in college, if any, by the subject and the gender of the subject) was collected.

Procedure

The experiment was conducted in various settings and at various times. Before conducting the experiment, packets containing arbitrarily distributed vignettes (one written in OBMOD terminology and one written in humanistic terminology) with each vignette followed by a copy of both the TEI and the Semantic Differential scale with demographic questions on the very back page were assembled. The administrator of the experiment arrived at the Sheraton, the psychology classes, and the business classes at a prearranged time. Upon arrival at each of these places, the packets were distributed to the

subjects who were instructed to read the vignettes and to fill out the scales immediately following them as honestly as possible. Therefore, each subject rated both a vignette written in OBMOD terminology and a vignette written in humanistic terminology (in no specific order) on both the TEI and Semantic Differential scales. Subjects were given as much time as desired to complete the packet. After the packets were collected, the subjects were debriefed as to the nature of the experiment and told that it was rating the acceptability of organizational behavior modification.

Results

The responses were scored from 1-7 with 1 being correlated with acceptability and 7 with unacceptability on the TEI, with 1 being correlated with good and 7 with bad on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, with 1 being correlated with strong and 7 with weak on the Potency subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, and with 1 being correlated active and 7 with passive on the Activity subscale of the Semantic Differential scale.

The means and standard deviations of the responses by the subjects to both types of vignettes on both the TEI and Semantic Differential including its three subscales (Evaluative, Potency, and Activity) were calculated (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

Means and standard deviations for female and male responses to both types of vignettes were also calculated for the TEI and Semantic Differential scales (see Table 2).

Insert Table 2 about here

The means and standard deviations for each of the subject groups' (psychology students, business students, and business workers) responses to both types of vignettes on both the TEI and the Semantic Differential scale with it's subscales were also calculated (see Tables 3 & 4).

Insert Tables 3 & 4 about here

Individual t-tests between overall means were run along with the nonparametric tests of the Spearman R, Mann-Whitney, Levene F for Variability, and the Wilcoxon. The mean responses to the OBMOD and humanistic vignettes on the TEI were compared and a significant difference was found at the .10 significance level with the humanistic vignettes being rated significantly more acceptable, $t(78)=1.80$, $.05<p<.10$. The overall mean responses to the OBMOD and humanistic vignettes on the Semantic Differential were compared and no significant difference was found, $t(78)=-.99$, $p>.10$. The mean responses to the OBMOD vignettes on the TEI and Semantic Differential scale were compared, and a significant difference was found with OBMOD vignettes being rated significantly better on the Semantic Differential scale than on the TEI, $t(78)=3.03$, $p<.01$. No significant difference was found between the overall responses to the humanistic vignettes on the TEI and Semantic Differential scales,

$t(78)=-.92$, $p>.10$. No significant difference was found between the overall responses to the OBMOD and humanistic vignettes on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, $t(78)=1.22$, $p>.10$. A significant difference was found between the responses to the OBMOD vignettes and the humanistic vignettes on the Potency subscale of the Semantic Differential scale with OBMOD vignettes being rated significantly stronger than humanistic vignettes, $t(78)=-2.93$, $p<.01$. There was no significant difference found between responses to the OBMOD and humanistic vignettes on the Activity subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, $t(78)=-1.27$, $p>.10$.

No significant difference was found between the females' and males' responses to the OBMOD vignettes on the TEI, $t(77)=1.54$, $p>.10$. There was also no significant difference found between females' and males' responses to either the humanistic vignettes on the TEI, $t(77)=-1.33$, $p>.10$, or to the OBMOD vignettes on the Semantic Differential scale, $t(77)=1.12$, $p>.10$. A significant difference was found between females' and males' responses to the humanistic vignettes on the

Semantic Differential scale with females rating the humanistic vignettes significantly more acceptable than the males, $t(77)=-1.89$, $.05<p<.10$.

One-way analyses of variance were run between each of the variables and the three groups of subjects (psychology students, business students, and business workers) to test for significant differences between the group's responses along with the Tukey test to test for main effect, the Scheffe Method, Levene's Test for Variability, Welch, and Brown-Forsythe tests. No significant differences were found between group responses to the OBMOD vignettes on the TEI, $F(2,76)=.62$, $p>.10$. No significant difference was found between groups for ratings of the humanistic vignettes on the TEI, $F(2,76)=2.12$, $p>.10$. For ratings of the OBMOD vignettes on the Semantic Differential scale, no significant difference was found between the groups, $F(2,76)=.39$, $p>.10$. There were also no significant differences found between the groups on their responses to the humanistic vignettes on the Semantic Differential scale, $F(2,76)=2.26$, $p>.10$. There was no significant differences between ratings of

the OBMOD vignettes on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, $F(2,76)=1.23$, $p>.10$. There was a significant difference found between group ratings of the humanistic vignettes on the Semantic Differential Evaluative subscale with psychology students rating humanistic vignettes significantly better on this subscale of the Semantic Differential scale than did business workers, but no significant difference was found between business students with the other two groups, $F(2,76)=5.28$, $p<.01$. No significant difference was found between group ratings of the OBMOD vignettes on the Potency subscale of the Semantic Differential subscale, $F(2,76)=.02$, $p>.10$. There was also no significant difference found between group ratings of the humanistic vignettes on the Potency subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, $F(2,76)=.36$, $p>.10$. Regarding the responses to the OBMOD vignettes on the Activity subscale of the Semantic Differential scale by the groups, no significant difference was found, $F(2,76)=.39$, $p>.10$. Finally, also on the Activity subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, there was no significant difference

found between group responses to the humanistic vignettes, $F(2,76)=1.01$, $p>.10$.

Discussion

As predicted, the humanistic vignettes were rated significantly more acceptable overall than were the OBMOD vignettes on the TEI, although this was only at the .10 significance level. These results coincide with those of Kazdin and Cole (1981) which showed that overall, BMOD was rated significantly more negatively than humanistic approaches both in techniques and terminology. It seems that their results may be generalizable to OBMOD as well. However, Kazdin and Cole (1981) also found a significant difference on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale between both BMOD conditions and neutral conditions and BMOD terminology and ordinary terminology. The current study found no such significant difference between OBMOD and humanistic vignettes on this scale which means that on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, OBMOD was not rated significantly better than the humanistic vignettes in the current study. These results go against Kazdin and Cole's

(1981) findings on BMOD and also against the findings that the Semantic Differential Evaluative subscale should support the findings of the TEI (Kazdin, 1980b). While the above findings suggest that OBMOD may suffer the same negative image as BMOD, they do not support other relevant findings about the scales used in the current study and do not substantiate the findings about BMOD vignettes being rated significantly worse on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale than humanistic or neutral vignettes to OBMOD and humanistic vignettes on the same scale.

Studies have utilized the TEI and Semantic Differential scales because they produce similar results and therefore, more reliable results (Davis, et al., 1989; Kazdin & Cole, 1981; Kazdin, 1980b). The current study found an overall significant difference between OBMOD vignettes and humanistic vignettes on the TEI, but found no such significant difference between these two variables on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale. In fact, overall on the Semantic Differential scale, OBMOD vignettes were rated significantly more acceptable than they were on the

TEI. These results may be due to the Potency and Activity subscales of the Semantic Differential scale because it was found that on the Potency subscale, OBMOD vignettes were rated significantly stronger than the humanistic vignettes which were rated as weaker. This may help to account for the significant difference found between OBMOD and humanistic vignettes on the TEI. It may be that the particular subjects who participated in the current experiment, would also rate something seen as stronger as less acceptable. These results may also account for the significant difference found between OBMOD vignettes on the TEI and Semantic Differential scale. Since stronger was rated as the number one and therefore correlated with the overall rating of acceptability, the fact that OBMOD vignettes were rated significantly stronger may account for them being found significantly more acceptable on the Semantic Differential scale than on the TEI. These results still do not, however, account for the lack of correspondence between the TEI and the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale where we would have expected a correspondence (Kazdin, 1980b)

and, since there was a significant difference on the TEI between OBMOD and humanistic vignettes, we would also have expected this difference on the Evaluative subscale. The fact that the significant difference on TEI was only at the .10 significance level may account for this lack of correspondence between the TEI and the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale.

The current study is a pioneer effort in that it is not an exact replication of another study. Therefore, it can be correlated to only so many studies, and then the other results that are produced can only be discussed in and of themselves. The current study found a significant difference between females' and males' responses to the humanistic vignettes on the Semantic Differential scale with females rating them significantly more acceptable. It can only be speculated about the difference found here. It may be due to the fact that females are more humanistically oriented, or to the fact that males were simply more neutral. It is also important to mention here that although the females rated the humanistic vignettes significantly more acceptable on the Semantic

Differential scale, there was no significant difference overall between the ratings of the humanistic vignettes on the TEI and the Semantic Differential scale. Therefore, the females' responses on the Semantic Differential scale were not enough to change the overall results of no significant difference between humanistic vignettes on the two different scales.

Along the same lines as above, on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, psychology students rated the humanistic vignettes significantly better than the business workers, but no similar differences were found between business students and either psychology students or business workers. This difference may be due to several factors such as the fact that most of the psychology students used were females who it has already been stated rated the humanistic vignettes significantly better on the Semantic Differential scale, the education of the psychology students, the experience of the business workers, or perhaps, the indifference of the business workers. While some statistically significant findings are reported from the current study, most of the

findings were not significant, or barely significant as in the case of the difference between OBMOD and humanistic vignettes on the TEI scale.

The lack of significance in the current study as well as the fact that the significant difference between OBMOD and humanistic vignettes on the TEI was small, may very well be a good sign for organizational behavior modification. It may be that OBMOD is viewed as acceptable or close to it and, this is good for the business field for OBMOD can then be used without damaging the image of business. This is also good for the psychology field from which this approach stems. The current findings (mainly that much of the study was not statistically significant) may indicate the fact that people are more tolerant of behavioral techniques in the workplace where they feel that when they take a job, it is part of the job, or that as adults, that such techniques are more acceptable when applied to adults. The current study produces some intriguing findings and, one of those is, through the large lack of statistical significance found, that organizational behavior modification may be viewed , or close to it,

as acceptable. Obviously, future research is needed before any substantial claims can be made.

Some suggestions for future research would be a larger number of subjects with more from the business world, perhaps less variable vignette storylines to account for variability in ratings due to vignettes, and the testing perhaps of both the higher educated versus the lower educated employees/employers to see if a difference in the acceptability of OBMOD exists in this area. Due to the lack of research on organizational behavior modification, before any comparison to the current study can be made and progress made as to the actual status and acceptability of organizational behavior modification, more research is desperately needed in this area.

References

Connolly, P. (1987). Coping with ethical decisions. USA Today, 116, 10.

D'Alessandro, D.F. (1990). Image building: Why is it so difficult? Vital Speeches of the Day, 56, 636-640.

Davis, J.R., Rawana, E.P. & Capponi, D.R. (1989). Acceptability of behavioral staff management techniques. Behavioral Residential Treatment, 4(1), 23-44.

Kazdin, A. E. (1980a). Acceptability of alternative treatments for deviant child behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 13, 259-273.

Kazdin, A. E. (1980b). Acceptability of time out from reinforcement procedures for disruptive child behavior. Behavior Therapy, 11, 329-344.

Kazdin, A. E. & Cole, P. M. (1981). Attitudes and labeling biases toward behavior modification: The effects of labels, content, and jargon. Behavior Therapy, 12, 56-68.

Miltenberger, R.G., Lennox, D. & Erfanian, N. (1989).

Acceptability of alternative treatments for persons with mental retardation: Ratings from institutional and community-based staff. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 93(4), 388-395.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.D., & Tannenbaum, P.H. (1957). The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Tingstrom, D.H. & Silver, N.C. (1989). Acceptability of school-based interventions: A replication with a black sample. The Journal of Psychology, 124(5), 587-589.

Appendix A

A Copy of the Semantic Differential Scale

Please place your checkmarks on the line that best characterizes your reaction to the approach. If the scale is difficult to rate, still put a checkmark that best reflects your general reaction to the approach. There is no need to spend much time on any one of the items. Your first impressions and immediate feelings about the items is what we would like.

(Evaluative)

good ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ bad

pleasant ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ unpleasant

kind ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ cruel

valuable ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ worthless

fair ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ unfair

(Potency)

strong ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ weak

hard ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ soft

heavy ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ light

large ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ small

thick ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ thin

(Activity)

active ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ passive

sharp ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ dull

hot ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ cold

fast ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ slow

ferocious ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ peaceful

Appendix B

A Copy of the TEI

Please complete the items listed below. The items should be completed by placing a checkmark on the line under the question that best indicates how you feel about the approach. Please read the items very carefully because a checkmark accidentally placed on one space rather than another may not represent the meaning you intended.

1. How acceptable do you find this approach to be for the worker's problem behavior?

not at all acceptable			moderately acceptable			very acceptable

2. How willing would you be to carry out this approach yourself if you had to change the worker's problems?

not at all willing			moderately willing			very willing

3. How suitable is this approach for workers who might have other behavioral problems than these described for this worker?

not at all suitable			moderately suitable			very suitable

4. If workers had to be assigned to an approach without their consent, how bad would it be to give them this approach?

very bad			moderately bad			not at all bad

5. How cruel or unfair do you find this approach?

very cruel			moderately cruel			not at all cruel

6. How consistent is this approach to common sense or everyday notions about what approaches in the workplace should be?

very different or inconsistent			moderately consistent			very consistent

7. To what extent does this approach treat the worker humanely?

does not treat humanely at all			treats them moderately humanely			treats them very humanely

8. To what extent do you think there might be risks in undergoing this kind of approach?

lots of risks			some risks			no risks

9. How much do you like the procedures used in this approach?

do not like them at all			moderately like them			like them very much

10. How effective is this approach likely to be?

not at all effective			moderately effective			very effective

11. How likely is this approach to make permanent improvements in the worker?

unlikely			moderately			very likely

12. To what extent are undesirable side effects likely to result from this approach?

many undesirable side effects			some undesirable side effects			no undesirable side effects

13. How much discomfort is the worker likely to experience during the course of the approach?

very much discomfort			moderate discomfort			no discomfort at all

14. Overall, what is your general reaction to this type of approach?

very negative			ambivalent			very positive

Appendix C

A Copy of Each Vignette Used

John is a salesman for Hoover Cleaners Inc. in Detroit. John is constantly late for work. John's manager has decided to utilize operant conditioning to shape John's avoidance behavior so that everyday John will be to work on time. John's manager will control John's behavior through the use of both positive and negative reinforcement, but not punishment. The first step will be to have a coworker model the appropriate behavior, getting to work on time, which will be followed by a reinforcer for this appropriate behavior. Then John will be expected to follow the model receiving reinforcers until his behavior has been shaped, and John's avoidance behavior has reached extinction.

(scenario 1, OBMOD)

John is a salesman for Hoover Cleaners Inc. in Detroit. John is constantly late for work. John's manager has decided to increase John's motivation in order to get him to work on time everyday. John's manager wants to redirect his purpose and to change his

attitude by meeting John's needs through giving him praise and more freedom such as an extra break on the job when he gets to work on time without damaging his self esteem. John will be moved to an area where he will be more likely to notice his coworkers getting to work on time and to follow their behavior with the incentives offered. It is hoped that this will have a positive effect on John's attitude in the hope that he too will want to exert a new positive attitude. John's manager believes that John will fulfill more of his human potential once he starts coming to work on time everyday.

(scenario 1, Humanistic)

Jennifer is an assembly line worker in an auto factory. Jennifer works the nightshift and often falls asleep. Jennifer's boss wants to shape Jennifer's behavior by utilizing both positive and negative reinforcement until Jennifer can stay awake all night at work. Jennifer's coworkers serve as models receiving reinforcers for each hour that they stay awake at work. Jennifer's behavior is expected to be conditioned in this manner as she follows her coworkers

behavior and receives reinforcers herself each hour until finally, Jennifer can stay awake all night, every night at work. Once Jennifer's behavior has become controlled through her sleeping behavior reaching extinction, her boss plans to eliminate both the positive and negative reinforcement.

(scenario 2, OBMOD)

Jennifer is an assembly line worker in an auto factory. Jennifer works the nightshift and often falls asleep at work. Jennifer's boss wants to increase Jennifer's motivation to stay awake by giving Jennifer purpose through giving her praise and extra break time. Jennifer will be expected to follow her coworkers receiving praise and break time for every hour that they stay awake. It is expected that Jennifer will follow her coworkers' and receive praise and break time herself accordingly until she stays awake all night at work. Once Jennifer's boss feels that Jennifer has fulfilled more of her human potential and acquired a positive attitude by increasing her motivation at work, Jennifer's boss will eliminate the incentives that

Jennifer had been receiving.

(scenario 2, Humanistic)

Ann is a bankteller at a Midwestern bank. Ann takes her time with each customer and consequently, she only helps a third of the amount of people that her coworkers help in a day. Ann's boss want to increase the amount of people that Ann helps in a day to that of her coworkers. Ann's boss plans to condition Ann's behavior by utilizing punishment in the early stages of conditioning and then by utilizing both positive and negative reinforcement in the later stages of conditioning as Ann's behavior becomes more controlled. Ann will observe her coworkers who will serve as models of the appropriate behavior. Ann will be expected to alter her behavior accordingly at first receiving punishment and then reinforcement as her behavior comes to equal that of her coworkers. Once Ann's behavior matches that of her coworkers for a prolonged period of time, the reinforcers will be extinguished.

(scenario 3, OBMOD)

Ann is a bankteller at a Midwestern bank. Ann takes her time with each customer and consequently, she

only helps a third of the amount of people that her coworkers help in a day. Ann's boss wants to increase the number of people that Ann helps in a day to that of her coworkers. Ann's boss wants to increase her motivation to help more people by, at first, putting her on probation for as long as she continues spending more than five minutes per customer reasoning that this will increase Ann's purpose, and then as Ann's human potential grows, her boss will give her praise and meet her needs by giving her more freedom again as long as she continues to help the same amount of people as her coworkers. For a couple of days, Ann will be expected to observe the actions of her coworkers on the job and to then follow in their tracks receiving the incentives mentioned until she helps as many customers as her coworkers help in a day. Ann's boss feels that in the long run this will increase Ann's creativeness and in time, she will no longer need incentives.

(scenario 3, Humanistic)

Table 1

Means and standard deviations of overall scores for both types of vignettes on the TEI and Semantic Differential Scale and its subscales

	TEI	Sem.Diff.	Evaluative	Potency	Activity
OBMOD					
X =	4.22	3.83	3.88	3.74	3.88
s.d. =	1.23	0.90	1.50	1.32	1.19
Humanistic					
X =	3.88	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.12
s.d =	1.29	1.00	1.62	1.24	1.08

Table 2

Female and male response means and standard deviations on the TEI and Semantic Differential Scale

		OBMOD		HUMANISTIC	
		TEI	Sem.Diff.	TEI	Sem.Diff.
Female					
X	=	4.40	3.93	3.71	3.79
s.d.	=	1.23	0.87	1.29	0.79
Male					
X	=	3.71	3.70	4.10	4.22
s.d.	=	1.29	0.93	1.25	1.19

Table 3

Means and standard deviations of the three groups responses to the OBMOD vignettes on the TEI, Semantic Differential scale, and its subscales

		OBMOD				
		TEI	Sem.Diff.	Evaluative	Potency	Activity
Psychology Students						
X	=	4.43	3.87	4.11	3.74	3.75
s.d.	=	1.21	.409	1.58	1.47	1.37
Business Students						
X	=	4.14	3.95	3.57	3.76	3.86
s.d.	=	1.20	1.18	1.35	1.14	0.91
Business Workers						
X	=	4.05	3.73	4.08	3.69	4.07
s.d.	=	1.31	.705	1.60	1.44	1.36

Table 4

Means and standard deviations for the group responses to the Humanistic vignettes on the TEI and the Semantic Differential and its subscales

	HUMANISTIC				
	TEI	Sem.Diff.	Evaluative	Potency	Activity
Psychology Students					
X =	3.48	3.79	2.90	4.43	4.12
s.d. =	1.07	.704	1.28	1.03	.976
Business Students					
X =	4.02	3.90	3.61	4.12	3.95
s.d. =	1.25	.923	.439	1.21	.942
Business Workers					
X =	4.19	4.39	4.38	4.38	4.40
s.d. =	1.57	1.37	1.96	1.54	1.42