THE ACCEPTABILITY OF

BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION IN BUSINESS

Amy L. Truitt

Submitted to the faculty of Lycoming College in partial

fulfillment of the requirements for Departmental Honors in

Psychology.

Approved by:

Kathy Cimini
Prof. Kathy Cimini

Howard Berthold
Dr. Howard C. Berthold

Edward A. Henninger
Prof. Ed Henninger

Gene D. Sprechini
Dr. Gene Sprechini

Running head: ACCEPTABILITY OF BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION

The Acceptability of Behavior Modification

in Business

Amy Lynn Truitt

Lycoming College

Abstract

The acceptability of behavior modification was assessed by providing 49 Conrail employees with packets each containing 2 of 4 vignettes, 1 written in organizational behavior modification terminology and 1 written in humanistic terminology. Using a modified version of the Treatment Evaluation Inventory developed by Kazdin (1980a) and the Semantic Differential scale (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957), subjects rated the acceptability of the vignettes. It was hypothesized that organizational behavior modification terminology would be rated significantly less acceptable than humanistic terminology, and that there will be a significant difference between the ratings of workers and management level employees, with workers rating OBM less acceptable than management. The results refute the hypothesis; organizational behavior modification terminology was rated significantly more acceptable than humanistic terminology ($p < .10$). These results contradict much of the earlier research which found that humanistic terminology was significantly more acceptable than behavior modification terminology. However, the results comparing acceptability for workers and management level employees supported the hypothesis.

The Acceptability of Behavior Modification

in Business

As a result of more sophisticated machinery, such as computers and telecommunications, businesses have become increasingly more complex and competitive. Because of this increase in sophistication, today's businesses need to remain competitive in all aspects in order to keep up with other organizations. Companies and their employees need to develop increased skills to cope with the growing scope of business. For managers, this means extensive training for themselves and their employees. They need to develop their employees into the best, most efficient workers possible. Managers need to become more effective, meaning they need to rely on effective methods of influencing employee's behaviors.

Behavior Modification is Effective in General

Behavior modification is the systematic manipulation of contingencies. These therapeutic interventions use rewards and punishments to increase desirable behaviors and decrease undesirable behaviors (Sherman, 1990). Behavior modification in general has applications both in and out of mental health settings. Kazdin (1978) claims that "treatment programs based on principles of operant conditioning have been extended to almost every type of treatment, educational, and health care facility from preschools to nursing homes, as well as to client populations ranging from psychiatric patients to the mentally

retarded" (p. x) (Sherman, 1990).

Research has shown that behavior modification is an effective method of behavioral control. For example, Fee, Matson, and Manikam (1990) conducted a study with preschoolers who frequently displayed behavior that interrupted class (talking out of turn, out of seat, and total disruptive behavior). After training, the teachers in the experimental group began using a nonexclusionary time-out package, while the control group did not receive active treatment for their disruptive behavior. The teachers conducted class as usual. Results showed a significant decrease in disruptive behaviors for the nonexclusionary time-out group; however, there were no significant changes for the control group. These dramatic improvements were found on all assessments used. Numerous text books describe hundreds of other successful demonstrations of the effectiveness of behavioral techniques (Steers & Porter, 1987).

Behavior Modification is Effective in Business

The application of behavioral principles and methods (behavior modification) to the study and control of individual or group behavior within organizational settings is referred to as organizational behavior modification, or OBM (Frederiksen & Lovett, 1980, as cited in Martin & Pear, 1992). Psychologists and business men and women work together to explain, predict, and influence employees' behaviors. These programs are typically

used to address such issues such as absenteeism, product quality
and quantity, and employee health and safety. It is fruitful
to combine knowledge from the areas of Business and Psychology
since both seek ways to modify behavior and also because behavior
modification works in the business setting just as it works
in settings such as mental health institutions, schools, and
prisons where BMOD is used more often. Some of the popular
interventions utilize praise and reward.

Penn & Bootzin (1990) found organizational behavior
modification to be effective when applied to shift workers.
The subjects were not completing the work assigned to them before
the following shift arrived. This cycle continued throughout
each days' shifts and at the end of the day, there was a lot
of unfinished work. A program was implemented where work breaks
and sensory stimulation were awarded to shift workers for
completing their work before the next shift reported. After
implementation, the workers were not only completing their work,
but also finishing early and beginning the next shifts work.

Raise the Acceptability Issue

If behavior modification is an effective method, why then
isn't business utilizing it more as a resource? Numerous people
have noted a reluctance to use behavioral techniques despite
its proven effectiveness. This has spawned considerable research
in what has come to be called the "acceptability" of behavior
modification. Table 1 summarizes some of this research. The

table demonstrates that while considerable research on the acceptability of behavioral techniques has been done in mental health and educational settings, very little has been done in the business settings. The table contains all of the studies listed in Elliotts' 1988 table and several other additional studies added due to a similarity to the current study.

Research on Acceptability in All Settings

The research that has been done on OBM has shown that the acceptability of its interventions is fairly low; however, it is viewed more positively in certain circumstances. Miltenberger, Lennox, and Erfanian (1989) conducted a study rating four behavior modification techniques using the Treatment Evaluation Inventory (TEI). The results showed that Differential Reinforcement of the other behavior (DRO) was rated most acceptable; this was followed by time-out, overcorrection, and contingent shock. The results from this study imply that techniques that are less restrictive and have no or few side effects are more acceptable, and also, that all techniques are more acceptable when used in extreme circumstances.

It is a common belief that the language and terminology of BMOD as well as its title have a lot to do with its negative reputation and the reluctance on the part of professionals to utilize its interventions. The use of BMOD began with animals in laboratories. It proved to be effective with animals and has been found to work with humans, but the cold sounding

terminology ("control", "engineered settings", "contingency management", "schedules of reinforcement") does not fare well when being compared with terminology used with other forms of intervention that have a much kinder tone (client based therapy, interpersonal communication, organizational leadership, etc.). Woolfolk, Woolfolk, and Wilson (1977) conducted a study with 144 college juniors having very little psychology background, and 50 education graduate students. He showed them a 10 minute film that demonstrated the use of a token economy in a special education classroom. Half of the viewers were told that the tape reflected principles of behavior modification and the other half was told that it represented humanistic and affective education. Using Likert type items from the Semantic Differential scale it was found that the students who were told that the video represented humanist/affective education gave the teacher more favorable ratings. In addition, the teaching method was said to promote more academic learning and emotional growth.

Barling and Wainstein (1979) extended the research of Woolfolk et. al. (1977) and maintained that a significant labeling bias exists against behavior modification in educational settings since the identical videotape was rated more acceptable when described in humanistic terms rather than with behavior modification terminology. Barling and Wainstein also suggested that their results were influenced by prior attitudes toward behavior modification.

Kazdin and Cole (1981) found similar results when comparing the acceptance of BMOD vignettes with humanistic and neutral vignettes. Subjects read and rated each type of vignette on the Teacher Classroom Evaluation scale and the Semantic Differential scale. Results showed that the BMOD vignettes were viewed significantly more negatively than the humanistic and neutral vignettes. The experimenters went a step further and constructed new vignettes utilizing BMOD terminology and others using ordinary terminology; still the BMOD vignettes were rated significantly more negatively. This suggests that it may, in fact, be the terminology that influences people.

Acceptability of Organizational Behavior Modification

The acceptability of an interventions approach is very important to its use and to the image of the field or organization that utilizes it. Generally, the image of a business is affected by its appearance to both its employees and the public. Because the image an employee holds affects their level of job satisfaction, therefore affecting such things as production, loyalty, and absenteeism, and the image the public holds affects sales and loyalty, it is important that business take an acceptable approach. Aside from remaining competitive, pleasing these two groups of people is what allows a company to remain viable. For this reason, it is very important to the business field that organizational behavior modification be the topic of more research. Davis, Rawana, and Capponi (1989)

studied the acceptability of BMOD in staff management. Results showed that instruction was the most acceptable method, followed, in order, by modeling, self management, reinforcement and punishment.

Several students at Lycoming College and Bucknell University have added to the scarce collection of studies based on the acceptability of BMOD in business (OBM). Debbie Cardinale (cited in Berhold, 1982) administered a questionnaire to 15 managers and 15 workers who worked in a large fabric dying plant. The questionnaire contained 22 words to be rated on a 7 point scale, ranging from extremely positive to extremely negative. The instructions read, "Rate the following words on the basis of your initial reactions and perceptions of what they mean to you. Base your decisions with respect to on-the-job behavior." Half of the terms on the questionnaire were taken from a behaviorally oriented text and the other 11 from a traditional management text. The words were listed in random order. Results showed that traditionally based words were rated very positively and behavioral terms fell in a neutral zone.
Lynn Gramley (1992), another Lycoming College student, continued to probe the work force by following the research of Kazdin and Cole (1981). Her study focused on acceptability of OBM through a comparison of vignettes written in OBM terminology and humanistic terminology. Her subjects were 19 business workers, 33 business students, and 27 psychology students. Packets including two arbitrarily ordered vignettes (one in

humanistic terminology and one in OBM terminology), a copy of the TEI, and a copy of the Semantic Differential scale were assembled. At the experimental sights the packets were distributed to the subjects. Subjects were then instructed to read the vignettes and fill out the scales as honestly as possible. The results showed that humanistic vignettes were rated significantly more acceptable overall than were the OBM vignettes (p < .10).

Berthold (1983) conducted an experiment where he asked his subjects to indicate whether they believed each of 12 principles with ethical undertones to be true or false. The principles were obtained from a chapter that he had written which described misconceptions about behavior modification and ethical practices and were all false according to Berthold (Berthold, 1982). In addition, Berthold asked the subjects to indicate whether their position was upper level, middle level, or lower level. No one checked lower level and some people, such as clergy, did not check a level. There were 38 subjects who did, and there were approximately equal numbers in both the middle level and the upper level. Results showed that the middle level people felt 38% of the time behavioral programs involved practices not considered ethical or correct. In contrast, upper level people only rated 8% of the statements to be true; therefore, indicating they believe only 8% of the time unethical practices are carried out. In conclusion, if Bertholds' false statements are viewed as ethical principles,

then upper level people find BMOD to be more acceptable than middle level people.

The current study builds on this research by focusing on rating of the acceptability of OBM in an industrial setting, using 49 Conrail employees. Following the research of Kazdin and Cole (1981), Gramley (1993), and Berthold (1983) the present study rated the acceptability of OBM through a comparison of vignettes written in Humanistic terminology and OBM terminology. It was hypothesized that vignettes written in OBM terminology would be rated significantly less acceptable than vignettes written in humanistic terminology. It was also hypothesized that upper level management (third level) would rate OBM more acceptable than first level management and workers, respectively.

<center>Method</center>

Participants

Forty-seven, of 49 selected, Conrail employees from Pittsburgh PA volunteered to participate in this study, 2 withdrew. The subjects included 16 from first level management, 4 from third level management, and 27 workers.

Apparatus

Following Miltenberger, et al. (1989), Kazdin and Cole (1981), and Davis, et al. (1989), the current experiment was conducted using the Semantic Differential scale with its three subscales (Evaluative, Potency, and Activity) (Osgood, Suci, and 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 study because of its 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 was hoped the Evaluative subscale
would support the TEI. The purpose of Kazdin's pilot study
was to evaluate the TEI items. After applying factor analysis,
one item was dropped leaving 15 items which were found to be
reliable and were also supported by the Evaluative scale of
the Semantic Differential scale (Kazdin, 1980b). In the current
study, the TEI was modified (see Appendix B) to suit the purpose
of assessing OBM and consisted of 14 questions (one was dropped
due to lack of relevance).

The present experiment utilized 4 vignettes, both of which
were modified versions of those constructed by Lynn Gramley
(1992). The vignettes described 2 different scenarios, each
one written in OBM terminology and in humanistic terminology
(see Appendix C).

Procedure

The experiment was conducted in an open office at Conrail
headquarters in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. When the female
experimenter arrived, packets were distributed to each
individual. These packets contained arbitrarily ordered

vignettes (one written in OBM terminology and one written in humanistic terminology). Each vignette was followed by a copy of both the TEI and the Semantic Differential scale with demographic questions on the very back page. After the packets had been distributed to the subjects they were greeted by the experimenter and told that if at any time they felt uncomfortable in participating in the experiment they were welcome to withdraw. They were then instructed to read the vignettes and to fill out the scales that immediately followed them as honestly as possible. Then, each subject rated one of the 2 scenarios written in both OBM terminology and in humanistic terminology on both the TEI and the Semantic Differential scales. The subjects were given as much time as needed to complete the task. Some performed the task immediately and some between other daily activities. The packets were collected at the end of the working day and the subjects were debriefed, and thanked for their participation in the rating of the acceptability of organizational behavior modification.

Results

The responses were scored from 1-7 with 7 representing

acceptability and 1 representing unacceptability on the TEI,

with 7 representing good and 1 representing bad on the

Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, with

7 representing strong and 1 representing weak on the Potency

subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, and with 7

representing active and 1 representing 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 2).

Insert Table 2 about here

The means and standard deviations of responses for each

of the subject groups (workers, first level management, and

third level management) to both types of vignettes for both

the TEI and the Semantic Differential scales were also calculated

(See Tables 3 & 4).

Insert Tables 3 & 4 about here

Finally, means and standard deviations for the differences

in scores between humanistic and OBM vignettes for each of the

groups responses on the TEI, the Semantic Differential scale
and its subscales were calculated (See Table 5).

Insert Table 5 about here

Paired t-tests on overall means were performed. The mean
responses to the OBM and humanistic vignettes on the TEI were
compared and a significant difference was found at the .10
significance level with the OBM vignettes being rated
significantly more acceptable, $t(42)=-2.90$, $.0059 < p < .10$.
The overall mean responses to the OBM and humanistic vignettes
on the Semantic Differential were also compared but no
significant difference was found, $t(44)=-1.41$, $p > .10$.

In comparing the subscales of the Semantic Differential
scale, significance was found between the OBM and humanistic
vignettes on the evaluative subscale. The OBM vignettes were
rated significantly higher on the evaluative scale than the
humanistic vignettes, $t(44)=-2.67$, $p < .10$. There was no
significant difference between responses to the OBM and
humanistic vignettes on the Activity subscale of the Semantic
Differential scale, $t(44)=0.14$, $p > .10$.

One-way analyses of variance were performed between each
of the variables, (TEI, Semantic Differential, Evaluative,
Potency, and Activity) to compare the three groups of subjects
(workers, first line management, and third line management).
No significant differences were found in any of the these one-way

analyses of variance (See Table 6).

In addition, one-way analyses of variances were calculated for the differences among the groups on the TEI, Semantic Differential scale, and its subscales. In comparing the mean TEI responses among the three groups there were no significant differences between them, $F(2,41)=0.82$, $p > .10$. However, when comparing the overall mean response on the Semantic Differential scale among the three groups there were significant differences between the groups, $F(2,42)=2.67$, $.08 < p < .10$. This significance was found between the workers and first level management, $t(27)=2.21$, $0.03 < p < .10$. There was also significance when comparing the differences in responses between levels on the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale, $F(2,42)=3.16$, $0.05 < p < .10$. This significance was found between workers and first level management $t(38)=2.41$, $0.02 < p < .10$, and between workers and third level management $t(7)=2.11$, $0.06 < p < .10$. Finally, there was a significant difference between the total humanistic responses on the Semantic Differential scale in comparison to employee level, $F(2,42)=2.70$, $0.07 < p < .10$. The significance was found between workers and first level management, $t(30)=2.21$, $0.03 < p < .10$.

There was no significance when comparing the differences between levels on either the Potency or the Activity subscales of the Semantic Differential scale, $F(2,42)=1.55$, $p > .10$, $F(2,42)=0.36$, $p > .10$ respectively.

Discussion

Despite the prediction, that humanistic vignettes would
be rated significantly more acceptable than the OBM vignettes,
the OBM vignettes were rated overall significantly more
acceptable by the three groups of subjects on the TEI at the
.10 significance level. These results contradict findings by
Kazdin and Cole (1981), Woolfolk, Woolfolk, and Wilson (1977),
Lynn Gramley (1992), and many other researchers who have found
humanistic terminology to be significantly more acceptable than
OBM terminology. Supporting Kazdin's findings (1980b), that
the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential scale should
reinforce the results on the TEI, the OBM vignettes were also
rated significantly more acceptable on the Evaluative subscale
of the Semantic Differential scale.

Although there was a significant difference found between
the OBM vignettes and the humanistic vignettes overall on the
TEI and the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic Differential
scale, there was no over all significance found between the
two types of vignettes on the overall score of the Semantic
Differential scale, or its other two subscales, Potency and
Activity. This is odd because the TEI and the Semantic
Differential scale are utilized together because they produce
similar results and therefore more reliable results (Davis et
al, 1989; Kazdin, 1980b; Kazdin and Cole, 1981). Actually,
when comparing the means, for the totals of the Semantic
Differential scale and the Potency and Activity subscales, they

are very similar. Although the actual results show OBM to be
rated a little higher on the acceptability scales, the subjects
responses are falling in a neutral zone. The discrepancy between
the Semantic Differential scale and the TEI may be due to the
fact that the Evaluative subscale is most like the TEI, however
the Activity and Potency subscales are not as similar. In other
words, it makes sense that the subjects had similar significant
responses to the TEI and the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic
Differential scale. When comparing the means of the Activity
and Potency subscales for the humanistic and OBM vignettes,
responses were quite neutral.

Although no significance was found when comparing each
of the levels of employees on their overall responses to the
OBM vignettes on the TEI, comparison of the means supports the
present study's hypothesis and research done by Howard Berthold
(1983). The means showed that third level management was most
accepting of the OBM terminology followed by first level and
workers respectively. The total scores on the Semantic
Differential scale for the OBM vignettes did not support
Berthold's research (1983) or the hypothesis; the calculations
were not significant and when comparing the means first level
management responded more acceptably towards OBM than did the
third level management and workers respectively.

Similarly, supporting the hypothesis, responses to the
humanistic vignettes were rated significantly more acceptable
by the workers in comparison to the first line management who

rated the humanistic vignettes significantly less acceptable.
In opposition to the hypothesis third level management rated
the humanistic vignettes more acceptable than did first level
management. These results were not found on the TEI. When
comparing employee levels on the humanistic vignettes there
was no significant difference between the levels responses.
In addition, first level management rated the humanistic
vignettes more acceptable than did the workers as opposed to
the results on the Semantic Differential results. There was
also no significant difference when the three groups were
compared to the three subscales of the Semantic Differential
scale, Evaluative, Potency, and Activity, for both the humanistic
and the OBM vignettes.

When differences between the employee levels and their
responses on the humanistic and OBM vignettes were considered
there was a significant difference found on both the Semantic
Differential scale and the Evaluative subscale of the Semantic
Differential scale. On the Semantic Differential scale the
significant difference fell between the workers and the first
level management, but not between first level management and
the third level management, nor between workers and third level
management. This was in opposition to the proposed hypothesis
which said that the biggest difference would be between the
workers and the third level management. In addition overall
on the Semantic Differential scale the first line management
was more acceptable of OBM than third level management, also

in opposition of the hypothesis. In support of the hypothesis
not only was there a significant difference between levels on
the Evaluative subscale, but also the difference was between
all three groups with third level management being the most
accepting of the OBM vignettes. The difference on the TEI also
leaned toward the hypothesis that third level management was
most accepting of OBM, however there was no significant
difference between the three groups.

Although significance for the current study is minimal
(the only comparisons having significance being: TEI humanistic
vs. TEI OBM, Evaluative subscale humanistic vs. Evaluative
subscale OBM, Semantic Differential humanistic vs. employee
level, Evaluative subscale differences vs. level, and Semantic
Differential differences vs. level), there is evidence to support
the hypothesis that management level employees support the use
of OBM techniques more so than workers. This may be because
people who see themselves as the object of a behavioral program
rate it less favorably than the people who initiate a program.

There is also evidence contradicting the hypothesis in
that OBM is being rated more acceptable not only by management,
but also by workers. This is a positive finding for the world
of business and psychology. Perhaps employers and employees
are becoming more open to the idea of controlling behavior.
In addition it may mean that psychologists who design the
programs, and managers who implement them are communicating
better the meaning, importance, and ethics of the programs.

In conclusion, the current study seems to shed a more positive light on the use of behavior modification in the work place. Although many of the comparisons were not statistically significant, in comparing the mean responses between the OBM and humanistic vignettes both workers and management replied with a more acceptable attitude of OBM than in past research (Woolfolk, Woolfolk, and Wilson, 1977; Kazdin and Cole, 1981). Since very little research has been done on the acceptability of behavior modification in industrial settings, obviously continued research on the use of OBM and its acceptability is desperately needed before any substantial conclusions can be made.

Some suggestions for future research would be first, to survey more subjects and second, to survey a variety of corporations versus just one to get a more representative sample of the business field and their attitudes towards OBM. In addition it may be beneficial to use different questionnaires to measure attitudes toward the OBM and humanistic vignettes, such as the BIRS. Several studies, including the present study and the study similar done by Lynn Gramley (1992), have found discrepancies between the conclusions drawn by the TEI and the Semantic Differential scale. This is a curious result because they are suppose to reinforce one anothers reliability (Kazdin, 1980b).

Suggestions to further the acceptance of OBM by all levels of employees are first, to continue developing increased

communication between psychologists and managers. Second, managers and employees need to confront the issue head on; if one needs to predict and control behaviors, then behavior must be predictable and controllable (Berthold, 1975). Another approach may be to translate behavioristic jargon into more socially acceptable terms (Berthold, 1983). Another approach may be to translate OBM jargon into more socially acceptable terms, or to educate employers and employees of the OBM terminology. The most feasible answer seems to be to resist the dichotomy between humanism and behaviorism. There are two ways this can be done; through teachers and professors, and through behaviorists using humanistic terms to describe their feelings and concerns for people as much as possible (Berthold, 1983).

References

Barling, J. & Wainstein, T. (1979). Attitudes, Labeling Bias, and Behavior Modification in Work Organizations. <u>Behavior Therapy</u>, <u>10</u>, 129-136.

Berthold, H.C. (1975). What makes the other guy tick? Do you really want to know? <u>Quality Progress</u>, <u>8</u>(6), 20-21, 34.

Berthold, H.C. Behavior modification in the Industrial/organizational environment: Assumptions and ethics. In R.M. O'Brien, A.M. Dickinson, &M. Rosow (Eds.), (1982). <u>Industrial behavior modification: A management handbook.</u> New York: Pergamon Press.

Berthold, H.C. (1983). Behavioranalysisphobia: The current image of behavior analysis. <u>Ninth Annual Convention of the Association for Behavior Analysis.</u> Wisconsin: Milwaukee.

Cavell, T.A., Frantz, C.E., & Kelley, M.L. (1968a). Consumer acceptability of the single case withdrawal design: Penalty for early withdrawal? <u>Behavior Therapy</u>, <u>17</u>, 82-87.

Cavell, T.A., Fretz, C.E. & Kelley, M.L. (1968b). Acceptability of paradoxical interventions: Some nonparadoxical findings. <u>Professional Psychology: Research and Practice</u>, <u>17</u>, 519-523.

Clark, L., & Elliott, S.N. (1987). The influence of treatment strength information of knowledgeable teachers' pretreatment evaluations of social skills training methods. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Davis, J.R., Rawana, E.P. & Capponi, D.R. (1989).

Acceptability of behavioral staff management techniques.

Behavioral Residential Treatment, 4(1), 23-44.

Elliott, S.N., Turco, T.L., & Gresham, F.M. (1978).

Consumers' and clients' pretreatment acceptability ratings of

classroom-based group contingencies. Journal of School

Psychology, 25, 145-154.

Elliott, S.N. (1988). Acceptability of Behavioral

Treatments: Review of Variables That Influence Treatment

Selection. Professional Psychology, 19(1), 68-80.

Epstein, M.H., Matson, J.L., Repp, A., & Helsel, W.J.

(1986). Acceptability of treatment alternatives as a function

of teacher status and student level. School Psychology Review,

15, 84-90.

Fee, V.E.; Matson, J.L.; & Manikam, R. (1990). A Control

Group Outcome Study of a Nonexclusionary Time-out Package to

Improve Social Skills weth Preschoolers. Exceptionality, 1,

107-121.

Frentz, C., & Kelley, M.L. (1986). Parents' acceptance

of reductive treatment methods: The influence of problem severity

and perception of child behavior. Behavior Therapy, 17, 75-

81.

Gramley, L. (1992). The Acceptability of Behavior

Modification in Business. Williamsport, PA: Lycoming College.

Jensen, B.J.; Upton, L.R. (1991). The Acceptability of

Behavioral Treatments for Marital Problems. Behavior

Modification, 15,1, 51-63.

Kazdin, A.E. (1978). History of behavior modification: Experimental foundations of contemporary research. Baltimore: University Park Press.

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.

Kazdin, A.E., French, N.H., & Sherick, R.B. (1981). Acceptability of alternative treatments for children: Evaluation of inpatient children, parents, and staff. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 900-907.

Martens, B.K., Witt, J.C., Elliott, S.N., & Darveaux, D. (1985). Teacher judgements concerning the acceptability of school-based interventions. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 16, 191-198.

Martin, G.; Pear, J. (1992). Behavior Modification: What it is and how to do it. Englewood Coeffs, New Jersey: Simon & Schuster Company.

McKee, W.T. (1984). Acceptability of alternative classroom treatment strategies and factors affecting reachers' ratings. Unpublished master's thesis, Department of Educational

Psychology, University of British Columbia, Bancouver, Canada.

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.

Miltenberger, F.R.; Suda, K.T.; Lennox, B.D.; & Lindeman,
D.P. (1991). Assessing the Acceptability of Behavioral
Treatments to Persons with Mental Retardation. American Journal
on Mental Retardation, 96,(3), 291-298.

Norton, G.R.; Austen, S.; Allen, G.E.; Hilton, J. (1983).
Acceptability of Time out from Reinforcement Procedures for
disruptive Child Behavior: A further analysis. Child and Family
Behavior Therapy, 5, 31-41.

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

Penn, P. & Bootzin, R. (1990). Behavioral techniques for
engancing alertness and performance in shift work. Work and
Stress, 4(3), 213-226.

Rasnake, L.K.; Martin, J.; Tarnowski, J.; and Mulick, J.A.
(1993). Acceptability of Behavioral Treatments: Influence
of knowledge of Behavioral Principles. American Association
on Mental Retardation, 31, 247-251.

Shapiro, E.S., & Goldberg, R. (1986). A comparison of
group contingencies for increasing spelling performance among
sixth grade students. School Psychology Review, 15, 546-557.

Sherman, W.M. (1990). Behavior Modification. New York,

NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Steers, R.M.; & Porter, L.W. (1987).   Motivation and Work
Behavior. McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Witt, J.C.; Elliott, S.N., & Martens, B.K. (1984).
Acceptability of behavioral interventions used in classrooms:
The influence of teacher time, severity of behavior problem,
and type of intervention. Behavioral Disorders, 10, 95-104.

Witt, J.C., Martins, B.K. & Elliott, S.N. (1984). Factors
affecting teachers' judgements of the acceptability of behavioral
interventions: Time involvement, behavior problem severity,
type of intervention. Behavior Therapy, 15, 204-209.

Witt, J.C., Moe, G., Gutkin, T.B., & Andrews, L. (1984).
The effect of saying the same thing in different ways: The
problem of language and jargon in school-based consultation.
Journal of School Psychology, 22, 361-367.

Witt, J.C., & Robbins, J.R. (1985). Acceptability of
reductive interventions for the control of inappropriate child
behavior. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 13, 59-67.

Woolfolk, A.E., Woolfolk, R.L. & Wilson, G.T. A rose by
another name ...: Labeling bias and attitudes toward behavior
modification. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,
1977, 45, 184-191.

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   moderately   very
acceptable   acceptable   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   moderately   very
willing   willing   willing

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

____   ____   ____   ____   ____   ____   ____

not at all   moderately   very
suitable   suitable   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   not at all

                              bad   bad

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

‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾

very cruel   moderately   not at all

                              cruel   cruel

6. How consistent is this approach to common sense or everyday

notions about what approaches in the workplace should be?

‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾

very different   moderately   very consistent

or inconsistent   consistent

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

‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾   ‾‾‾‾

does not treat   treats them   treats them

humanely at all   moderately   very humanely

                            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   moderately   like them

them at all   like them   very much

10. How effective is this approach likely to be?

____   ____   ____   ____   ____   ____   ____

not at all   moderately   very effective

effective   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   some undesirable   no undesirable

side effects   side effects   side effects

13. How much discomfort is the worker likely to experience

during the course of the approach?

____   ____   ____   ____   ____   ____   ____

very much   moderate   no discomfort

discomfort   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 co-worker 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 every day. His manager wants to redirect his purpose,
change his attitude, and boost his selfesteem through giving
him unconditional positive regard. John will be moved to an
area where he will be more likely to notice his co-workers
getting to work on time and to follow theirbehavior with the
incentives offered. It is hoped that this will have a positive
effect on John's attitude in that he too will want to exhibit

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)

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 co-workers help in a day.
Ann's boss wants to increase the number of people that Ann helps
in a day to that of her co-workers. Ann's boss will shape Ann's
behavior, positively reinforcing successive approximations of
the desired behavior, of waiting on the same number of customers
every day as her co-workers. Ann will also observe her
co-workers who will serve as models of the appropriate behavior.
Ann will be expected to continue to approach the desired
behavior, receiving positive reinforcement for closer
approximations and no feedback at all for regressions. Once
Ann's behavior matches that of her co-workers for five
consecutive days, the frequency of reinforcement by the boss
will be reduced as natural reinforcers come to control behavior.
                                             (scenario 2, 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 co-workers help in a day.
Ann's boss wants to increase the number of people that Ann helps

in a day to that of her co-workers. 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. It is hoped that this will increase

Ann's purpose. 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 co-workers. For a couple of days, Ann will be expected

to observe the actions of her co-workers on the job and to then

follow in their tracks receiving the incentives mentioned until

she helps as many customers as her co-workers 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 2, Humanistic)

Table 1
Summary of Research on Treatment Acceptability

Subjects	Independent Variable(s)	Dependent Measure(s)	Major Findings
		Kazdin (1981)	
Undergraduate students	Treatment efficacy, and ratings of acceptability	TEI, Semantic Differential	Reinforcement more acceptable than other treatments (positive practice, time-out, medication), and effectiveness of treatment did not influence acceptability
		Kazdin, French, & Sherick (1981)	
Children in treatment, Parents of children on unit, & Unit staff	Evaluation of clinical treatments on children with severe behavior problems	TEI, Semantic Differential	Reinforcement of incompatible behavior more acceptable than positive practice, medication, & time-out from reinforcement
		Norton, Austen, Allen, & Hilton (1983)	
Elementary & middle school teachers, and parents	Acceptability and effectiveness of behavioral procedures for disruptive children	5 point Likert type scale	Teachers rated procedures as more acceptable and effective than did parents. In addition, more acceptable for 5 year olds than 10 year olds
		McKee (1984)	
Regular education teachers	Teachers' knowledge of behavior principles, type of problem, type of intervention	TEI, Semantic Differential	High-knowledge teachers rated treatments more acceptable than did low-knowledge teachers; treatments were rated differentially, and reinforcement was significantly more acceptable than time-out and positive practice; ratings for the different problem cases were not different
		Witt, Elliott, & Martens (1984)	
Preservice and student teachers	Intervention type (positive vs. reductive), teacher time involvement, behavior problem severity	IRP	Interventions that were positive and required less teacher time were most acceptable; severity of the behavior problem did nignificantly influence ratings of acceptability
		Witt, Martens, & Elliott (1984)	
School teachers (kindergarten through Grade 12)	Intervention type, teacher time involvement, behavior problem severity	IRP	Interventions requiring more time to implement were least acceptable to teachers
		Witt, Moe, Gutkin, & Andrews (1984)	
Regular and special education teachers	Jargon of Tx description, behavior problem severity, teacher experience	IRP	Pragmatic description was more acceptable than behavioral or humanistic descriptions; interventions were rated as more acceptable when the problem was severe; highly experienced teachers rated interventions as less acceptable
		Martens, Witt, Elliot, & Darveaux (1985)	
Regular and special education teachers	Behavior problem severity; interventionist; case intervention modality	IRP-15, Semantic Differential	Interventions requiring moderate amounts of time were most acceptable interventions were rated as more acceptable when the problem behavior was severe
		Witt & Robbins (1985)	
Regular education preschool and Headstart teachers	Type or intervention, behavior problem severity, teacher experience; interventionist	IRP	Positive interventions were rated as more acceptable than reductive strategies; teachers with less

Table 1 (continued)

Subjects	Independent Variable(s)	Dependent Measure(s)	Major Findings
			experience rated interven tions as more acceptable than did experienced teachers
	Cavell, Frentz, & Kelley (1986a)		
Middle and high school teachers	Paradoxical treatments	TEI	Teachers rated paradoxical procedures as generallu un acceptable and significantly lower than an unsuccessful contingency contract; rat- ings of the four paradoxical conditions varied according to rationale
	Cavell, Frentz, & Kelly (1986b)		
Middle and high school teachers	Withdrawal of treatments	TEI	Acceptability of withdrawal conditions varied with te- spect to rationale
	Epstein, Matson, Repp, & Helsel (1986)		
Regular and special education teachers	Five alternative treatment approaches	TEI	In two experiments, teach- ers could distinguish betwe- en treatments on the basis of their acceptability; no differences were found be- tween regular and special education teachers or be- tween children labeled as mentally retarded or learn- ing disabled
	Frentz & Kelley (1986)		
Mothers of children aged 2-12	Five alternative (reductive) Tx intervention	TEI	Treatments were rated as more acceptable when applied to a more severe behavior problem
	Shapiro & Goldberg (1986)		
Sixth graders	Type of group contingency	CIRP; spelling performance	Group contingencies did not differentially affect spelling performance; however, sixth graders rat- ed independent group con- tingency as more accept- able than the interdepen- dent or dependent group contingency
	Clark & Elliott (1987)		
Regular and special education teachers	Behavior problem type, inter- vention tyupe, outcome in- formation, teachers' intervention knowledge	BIRS; Teachers' intervention Use Assessment	Teachers preferred model- ing, coaching to overcor- rection for social skills problems; treatment out- come information signifi- cantly influenced ratings of both acceptability and effectiveness
	Elliott, Turco, & Gresham (1987)		
Regular education teachers	Rater, behavior problem severity, intervention type, sex of rater	CIRP; IRP	Children rated all three types of group contingen- cies as acceptable; teachers

Table 1 (continued)

Subjects	Independent Variable(s)	Dependent Variable(s)	Major Findings
			and psychologists rated dependent group contingencies as unacceptable, independent and interdependent forms as acceptable
	Von Brock & Elliott (1987)		
Regular education teachers	Behavior problem severity, intervention type, outcome information	BIRS; Semantic Differential	Birs reliabley measures acceptability and effectiveness; treatment outcome information was shown to influence ratings of treatments
	Davis, Rawana, & Capponi (1989)		
Management staff	acceptability of behavioral staff management techniques		
	Jenson (1991)		
Married student volunteers	Acceptability of treatment components commonly used with behavioral marital therapy	Expectancies for change inventory & TEI	Married female subjects preferred communication/ problem solving skills training to behavioral exchange/ contracting procedures
	Lennox, Lindeman, Miltenberger, & Suda (1991)		
Mentally retarded who live in community residential facilities	Acceptability of behavioral treatments	Treatment acceptance scale	Dro rated more acceptable with mild behavior problems; when applied to severe behavior problems there was no significant difference
	Rasnake, Martin, Tarnowski, & Mulick (1993)		
Direct care staff members employed at ICF	Acceptability of 6 behavioral treatments; DRO, DRI, Stimulus control, Overcorrection, Physical restraint, & shock	Intervention Rating Profile	Treatments requiring less labor and time were rated as more acceptable than interventions requiring more labor and time

Table 2

Means and standard deviations of overall scores for both types of vignettes on the TEI and Semantic Differential Scale and its subscales. In addition the difference between the two vignette scores.

	TEI	Sem.Diff.	Evaluative	Potency	Activity
OBMOD					
x =	4.44	4.24	4.73	4.01	3.98
s.d. =	1.66	1.26	1.72	1.63	1.35
Humanistic					
x =	3.47	3.87	3.76	3.84	4.03
s.d. =	1.32	1.23	1.56	1.65	1.61
Difference					
x =	-0.96	-0.36	-0.97	-0.17	0.04
s.d. =	2.18	1.73	2.43	2.38	2.20

Table 3

Means and standard deviations of the three groups responses

to the OBM vignettes on the TEI, Semantic Differential Scale,

and its subscales.

	TEI	Sem.Dif.	OBM Evaluative	Potency	Activity
Workers					
x =	4.20	4.09	4.25	3.93	4.10
s.d. =	1.87	1.30	1.89	1.67	1.45
1st Level Management					
x =	4.81	4.43	5.29	4.16	3.85
s.d. =	1.35	1.26	1.42	1.66	1.24
3rd Level Management					
x =	5.19	4.30	5.20	3.85	3.85
s.d. =	0.87	1.24	1.09	1.67	1.45

Table 4

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

		Humanistic			
	TEI	Sem.Diff.	Evaluative	Potency	Activity
Workers					
x =	3.43	4.25	4.10	4.26	4.40
s.d. =	1.32	1.11	1.65	1.63	1.58
1st Level Management					
x =	3.65	3.38	3.40	3.20	3.56
s.d. =	1.38	1.32	1.41	1.69	1.64
3rd Level Management					
x =	3.12	3.68	3.25	4.00	3.80
s.d. =	1.44	1.03	1.36	0.81	1.52

Table 5

Means and standard deviations for the differences between humanistic and OBM for each of the groups responses on the TEI, the Semantic Differential scale and its subscales.

Differences

Between Humanistic and OBM Responses

	TEI	Sem.Dif.	Evaluative	Potency	Activity
Workers					
x =	-0.65	0.16	-0.15	0.33	0.30
s.d. =	2.41	1.39	2.63	2.11	1.99
1st Level Management					
x =	-1.15	-1.05	-1.89	-0.96	-0.29
s.d. =	1.63	1.92	1.96	2.66	2.43
3rd Level Management					
x =	-2.07	-0.61	-1.95	0.15	-0.05
s.d. =	2.19	2.08	1.31	2.34	2.78

Table 6

One-way analyses of vareance between each of the variables,

TEI, Semantic Differential, Evaluative, Potency, and Activity,

and the three groups.

              OBM   Humanistic

TEI $F(2,41)=1.00$, $p > .10$ $F(2,40)=0.26$, $p > .10$

SD $F(2,42)=2.70$, $p > .10$ $F(2,42)=2.70$, $0.07 < p < .10$*

Eval $F(2,42)=2.05$, $p > .10$ $F(2,42)=1.25$, $p > .10$

Pote $F(2,42)=2.19$, $p > .10$ $F(2,42)=0.11$, $p > .10$

Acti $F(2,42)=0.17$, $p > .10$ $F(2,42)=1.42$, $p > .10$

* significance found between workers and first level management