



Affordable ABA

Interbehavioral Psychology and Organizational Behavior Management



Introduction	2
Section 1: Complex Settings.....	2
Research on Organizational Complexity in OBM	3
Basic Behavioral Principles in Organizational Settings.....	6
Section 1 Personal Reflection	8
Section 1 Key Words	9
Section 2: Interbehavioral Psychology	9
Implications for OBM and Behavior Analysis.....	10
Section 2 Personal Reflection	14
Section 2 Key Words	14
Section 3: Setting Conditions That Exist in Organizational Settings	14
Higher Education	15
Interdisciplinary Science.....	19
Section 3 Personal Reflection	21
Section 3 Key Words	21
References	22

Introduction

Organizational behavior management (OBM) is a subfield of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) that focuses on the study of behavior within organizational settings. It is important to develop a conceptual understanding and technology of complex behavior in organizations as well as the behavioral principles that are utilized within OBM. Behaviors that occur within organizational settings may be especially susceptible to influence from various contextual factors. Therefore, it is important to identify some common themes within the OBM literature, noting the conceptual problems that are raised, and to propose possible solutions and directions for future research within the area.

In this course, participants will learn to (1) identify common themes within the OBM literature, (2) discuss conceptual problems within the OBM literature, and (3) identify possible solutions and directions for future research.

Section 1: Complex Settings

OBM has a multitude of unique features. Although it can be ascertained that all settings are complex in some regard as they are multifactored, behaviors that occur within an organizational setting are noted as being susceptible to influence from a variety of contextual factors. The field of behavior analysis continues to become increasingly interested in the study of contextual variables; however, the study of behavior within an organization necessitates that we think more contextually than most of those that are within the field of behavior analysis are typically required to do.

There has been a great amount of progress within the area of OBM that has been completed over the years by behavior analysts (Dickinson, 2001; VanStelle et al., 2012). For example, interventions that have been developed with the focus on

providing feedback (Alvero et al., 2001), tasks that are used to clarify (Tittelbach et al., 2007), as well as behavior-based training (Gravina et al., 2013) have all been discussed within the literature surrounding OBM. Even though these areas of research have been noted as being useful and have provided the field of behavior analysis with a multitude of tools to utilize for assessment and improvement of employee performance, it is also the notion that much of this research does not focus on the complexity that is entailed within organizational settings. In fact, a review of the literature within the area of OBM research in human service settings revealed that most of the research within this area has been centered around front line staff performing repetitive tasks (Gravina et al., 2018). As a result, it has been recognized that even though organizational behavior is more than likely to occur within a complex setting, the research surrounding OBM has not always been directed toward this specific context. However, there are several avenues within the field that have suggested that OBM is moving toward the direction of having an increased focus on this complexity.

Research on Organizational Complexity in OBM

Behavioral Systems Analysis

An area of scholarship and application that is housed within OBM and is focused on organizational complexity is that of behavioral systems analysis (BSA; Malott, 2003). BSA is an approach to organizational design and management that combines both the principles of ABA and the principles behind general systems theory. It narrows in on improving performance of individuals by analyzing the interconnectedness of behaviors within an organization and how they relate to the overall system and its environment. By understanding these relationships, this approach attempts to create positive change that benefits the performance of both the individual and organization. Models that are BSA focused place an

emphasis on a larger context within behavior analytic work. This type of approach involves the consideration of different levels of analysis, and the exact number of levels that are involved depend on the specific model. For example, it is commonly found that BSA often includes consideration of the organizational level, the process level, and the job-performer level. It is also found that most of the research and application within OBM has a focus on the job-performer level and is noted as being found under what most consider to be performance management. It is important to note that even though BSA is known to be behavior analytic in nature, little focus is placed on the traditional contingency constructs such as discriminative stimuli and/or reinforcers within these types of models. This should not come as a surprise to anyone as one should not assume that the principles that are derived from the study of individual behavior act similarly to that at a systems level. However, it is important to emphasize that most of the terminology that is utilized within BSA is not used within other areas of behavior analysis.

Metacontingencies

The literature surrounding metacontingencies has been focused on the complexity that is present within various organizational settings, causing an uptick of interest within the field of behavior analysis throughout the years (Zilio, 2019). A metacontingency describes a functional relationship between interlocking behavioral contingencies, their aggregate product, and a selecting environment. It examines how groups of people, through various interconnected behaviors, produce aggregate outcomes that are then subject to selection by environmental factors. This differs from individual-level operant conditioning in that the focus is instead on the selection of cultural practices and group-level behaviors. Although there are different models that place emphasis on various factors that contribute to cultural and organizational circumstances (Glenn, 2004; Glenn et al., 2016), all of the metacontingency models describe control of the occurrences of culturants

through selection of events or a recipient of systems. Culturants refer to classes of interlocking behavioral contingencies that result in aggregate products (Hunter, 2012) that are able to be chosen by environments that are external. Through the identification of the culturant as a unit of selection, metacontingencies are able to offer a versatile and scalable approach for understanding the way in which group interactions and their products are able to be controlled by cultural consequences (Tadaiesky & Tourinho, 2012) without having to perform a molecular analysis on how members of a group interact with one another. Even though there were earlier conceptualizations of metacontingencies that encompassed two- and three-term contingency constructs (Glenn, 1988), metacontingencies have now developed constructs (Glenn et al., 2016), analytical logic (Baia & Sampaio, 2019), and experimental procedures (Soares et al., 2019) that the field of behavior analysis does not commonly share.

Derived Stimulus Relations/Acceptance and Commitment Training

Another area of research that is focused on expanding the scope of research and practice that is inclusive of OBM is that of derived stimulus relations and Acceptance and Commitment Training (ACT; Hayes et al., 2006; Moran, 2015). ACT is a therapeutic approach and practical application of ACT that attempts to increase an individual's psychological flexibility by teaching individuals to accept difficult thoughts and feelings while committing to actions aligned with their values. It is important for behavior analysts to understand the extent to which derived stimulus relations are involved with OBM as well as the interventions that are used to target these derived relations in an effort to improve cooperation and establish relationships between work behavior and values as well as a multitude of other things. The work that has been conducted in this area stands out as it is representative of an area of behavior that is not commonly referred to within the

OBM literature. Furthermore, the literature within this area also includes terminology that is not often utilized within traditional behavior analytic work.

Cultural Science

The work that has been conducted within the area of cultural science is unique as it specifically suggests a more interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary path to behavior analytic work on organizational complexity. The work in this area also acts to expand upon traditional contingency analyses and incorporates the use of new terminology as well as other things. The work that has been conducted in this area is distinct from other areas in that there is an explicit call for interdisciplinary and/or transdisciplinary work that can address the complexity that exists within groups and organizations.

Basic Behavioral Principles in Organizational Settings

From its inception, the field of behavior analysis has yearned to be a single integrated science that includes multiple sub-domains. Although some may argue about the boundaries that are present among these domains, it is commonly agreed upon that behavior analysis includes discussions surrounding theory and philosophy, basic research in the experimental analysis of behavior (EAB), ABA, and practice also being considered either an additional domain or extension of the applied domain (Moore & Cooper, 2003). It is believed that each of these domains interact and influence each other in a variety of ways. For example, EAB has the goal and focus of understanding basic behavioral processes as well as how each of these processes operate under different circumstances. It is also the assumption that these processes will have implications for the development of different theories and applications in various circumstances that are socially important. ABA is centered around the study of basic processes in socially important contexts, and practice utilizes the resulting technology within the service delivery model. The

foundation of each of these areas of work is based in both theory and philosophy. As a result, each of these areas come together and work cohesively with the assumption that there is a relationship that is present between each of these areas of work. For example, it may be assumed that work that is conducted within EAB will be cited by those within the domain of ABA and vice versa and that both domains will abide by the behavioral theory and philosophy that has been established.

Although the individuals that work within these subdomains have common aspirations of achieving and sustaining relationships across the different subdivisions of behavior analysis, there are also those that question whether or not the field is as integrated as it has hoped to be. In early research, the extent to which research that was published in applied journals cited literature from EAB noted that there were few citations from EAB that were maintained within the applied literature (Poling et al., 1994). Furthermore, it was found that both the applied and EAB domains were becoming more separated. As time has progressed, it has been found that this continues to still be the situation (Elliott et al., 2005). Although this particular relationship continues to be of interest to those within the field, the relationship that exists among other subdomains have also been of interest. Therefore, although it may be assumed that the various domains that are within the field of behavior analysis may interact and participate within the science of behavior as a whole, this is not what has been characteristic of the domains at this time. This separation may exist as a result of a multitude of factors. One possible factor may be how the field of behavior analysis is conceptualized as a discipline (Hayes et al., 2009).

Similar themes have also been evaluated within the OBM literature. For example, researchers have analyzed the extent to which research that has been published within the Journal of Organizational Behavior Management (JOBM) has been described using terms founded within behavioral principles (Normand et al.,

1999). It was found that only 35% of the studies within this targeted research discussed behavioral principles. Furthermore, it is important to note that basic experimental studies were discussed less and that research was more likely to discuss behavioral principles as they related to applied studies.

In more recent research, the role of behavioral principles within the OBM literature was evaluated even further (DiGennaro Reed et al., 2016). These researchers noted that there was an overall increase in the number of articles that included the mention of behavior principles either in the introduction or the discussion of the article with at least 52.8% of the articles doing so that were included in the analysis. Additionally, it was noted that 71.6% of the articles included the mention of reinforcement, 34.3% of the articles mentioned discriminative stimulus, and 31.3% of the articles mentioned motivating operations. It was also found that articles that included research being conducted in a laboratory setting were more likely to discuss behavioral principles.

The aforementioned research highlights common themes that are found within the OBM literature. Although there were strategies that were discussed that could be used to improve the percentage of studies that discuss work in behavioral terminology, the possibility that these particular principles were not aligned with the dynamics of organizational settings was not even thought of. This means that it is possible that principles of behavior that have been developed from the observation of individuals may not lend themselves to that of the analysis of behavior that occurs within organizational settings.

Section 1 Personal Reflection

Are there other themes that you think would be common within the OBM literature? What do you believe should take place for behavioral principles to become more integrated into the work that is being conducted within the OBM

realm?

Section 1 Key Words

Acceptance and Commitment Training - a therapeutic approach and practical application of ACT that attempts to increase an individual's psychological flexibility by teaching individuals to accept difficult thoughts and feelings while committing to actions aligned with their values

Behavioral systems analysis - an approach to organizational design and management that combines principles of ABA and general systems theory

Culturants - classes of interlocking behavioral contingencies that result in aggregate products that are able to be chosen by environments that are external

Metacontingency - describes a functional relationship between interlocking behavioral contingencies, their aggregate product, and a selecting environment

Section 2: Interbehavioral Psychology

Interbehavioral psychology is not a commonly known approach within the science of behavior. Interbehavioral psychology is a system of psychology that focuses on the interactions between organisms and their environment, emphasizing the dynamic interplay of stimulus and response within a specific context. Although there are various features of interbehaviorism (Kantor, 1953) and interbehavioral psychology (Kantor, 1958) that pertain to behavior analysis (Fryling & Hayes, 2018), interbehavioral psychology is recognized for the field construction. The interbehavioral field is a way for conceptualization of the subject matter that is contained within behavior science. There are several different features of the field construct which allows for it to be a distinct alternative to other common ways of conceptualizing the information within behavior analysis. For example, when the

term interbehavior is utilized instead of just the word behavior, it represents a shift in emphasis away from behavior and instead a move toward a more specific focus on the relationships that are present among stimulation and responding. As a result, it is because of this idea that interbehaviorists prefer a double headed arrow $S_f \longleftrightarrow R_f$ instead of the $S \rightarrow R$ linear model which is often utilized within behavior analysis. This interaction, however, is only a small component of the interbehavioral perspective. Furthermore, the psychological event construct is noted by the following formula: $PE = C(k, sf, rf, st, hi, md)$. The PE is representative of the psychological event, the C is known as the integrated nature of the factors that make up the event, k is for the unique configuration of factors that are included within each event, sf is for the stimulus function, rf is for the response function, st is for the setting conditions, hi is for the interbehavioral history, and md is for the medium of contact (Kantor, 1958).

Implications for OBM and Behavior Analysis

A feature that is associated with the psychological event (PE) is that it is one integrated happening which means that it is one event. This component of the PE is actually represented by the C in the formula mentioned above. The remaining components (e.g. sf, rf, hi, st, md, k) all occur within one moment. Each of these different factors that are involved in the PE are mentioned separately purely for analytical purposes. This means that there is no stimulation without responding, no stimulation without setting conditions, and no setting conditions without an interbehavioral history.

For example, an employee that is engaging in work activities within an organization may be considered from the viewpoint of the PE. At first glance, the behavior of the individual is occurring within a setting in the environment which contains a multitude of setting conditions that are present. Some of these may

include the method in which the employee receives compensation, the role within the work environment that the employee has, the relationship that the employee role has to other roles that are within the organization, the work hours that are available within the organization and how those are allocated to the employee throughout the week, as well as the benefits that are provided to the employee that are associated with their job. Furthermore, the employee may have recently had a performance review that was only somewhat positive or an argument that occurred recently with a coworker. The employee may have also been working on a task that is not pleasant and associated with aversive stimulation such as different comments from a superior. In this situation, the stimulus functions that are associated with the task might be more than what they seem to someone that is conducting an observation. This could mean that the task has now acquired the substitute stimulus functions of the aversive experiences that are aligned with it. Throughout these complex experiences, the employee's interbehavioral history is continually present within the situation. These factors that have been mentioned are only some of the factors that may be thought of when considering the perspective of the PE. It is important to note that there are a multitude of factors that should be considered when employee behavior is conceptualized from the perspective of the PE.

This particular analysis is different from other ways of thinking about behavior in behavior analysis. For example, when evaluating respondent conditioning, stimuli are viewed as preceding responding and elicit responding to occur. Constructs that are included within operant conditioning also occur in a similar linear sequence, referring to a consequence that follows the exhibition of a behavior and in turn impacts the future evocative functioning of antecedent stimuli. Furthermore, the motivating operation construct also is dependent on this linear way of thinking (Hayes & Fryling, 2014). On the other hand, the PE construct does not align with this aforementioned linear sequence. This does not mean, though, that the PE is

ahistorical. Instead, it is known that interbehavioral history is a factor. History is viewed as participating in the current psychological event and as this event continues to change and evolve, the history involved does as well. If the perspective of the PE is taken into consideration, then it is viewed that all psychological happenings are occurring in the present, including those that refer to the past and future (Fryling & Hayes, 2010).

Additionally, when it is viewed that each factor contained with the PE is a participant in a unitary happening, it is also seen that none of its “parts” are believed to be causing others of its “parts” (Fryling & Hayes, 2011). A result of this is that a more detailed consideration of the participating factors for the current event should be encouraged. If one is to operate in terms of traditional operant constructs, this can lead to an emphasis on understanding the consequences of behavior in a more or less exclusive manner. A substantial amount of research has been conducted regarding the use of feedback that has been contingent on employee behavior (Alvero et al., 2001). However, from the viewpoint of PE, behavior is not thought of as being distinct from stimulation, history, or the setting. Instead, the implication is that all factors are important enough of the same consideration that is given to the consequences in behavior analysis.

There is another component of the PE that also requires additional consideration. The PE construct includes both stimulus and response functions (Kantor, 1958). The use of the word function is important: interbehavioral psychology notes a distinction that is present between stimulus objects and stimulus functions as well as the movements that occur between that of the organism and the response functions. As a result, attention is further drawn to the psychological aspects that exist in regard to stimulating and responding. This emphasis and distinction allows for an analysis of responding to occur with regard to stimuli that are psychologically but not physically present, otherwise known as responding that occurs with substitute stimulation. This enables the analysis of a wide range of

behavior that most assume are private or typically unavailable for study within mainstream behavior analysis.

The PE construct places an emphasis on the various factors that participate in psychological happenings. This offers several implications for the study of complex behavior as well as for developing a more coherent philosophical foundation for the work that is conducted in the field of behavior analysis (Fryling & Hayes, 2018). Furthermore, with the interest that is present for addressing more complex circumstances in organizational settings, the PE construct also has implications for the continued expansion of the work that is being done within OBM.

In some ways, the PE construct may have already had an impact on both the theory and the research that is within OBM. Researchers have noted that the elaborated five-term contingency has been constructed based on the idea that sociological events consist of interrelated factors that should be viewed as being independent of one another and not reduced to events that are below the sociological level of analysis (Houmanfar et al., 2010; Glenn, 2010). This approach has been noted as being helpful in understanding the complexity that exists within an organization in the areas of leadership (Houmanfar et al., 2015), participation of rules and policies (Houmanfar et al., 2009), and cultural resiliency (Ardila Sanchez et al., 2019). Although organizations may be thought of as being irreducible units that occur on the sociological level, they also involve PEs that involve individuals behaving on the psychological level. While interbehavioral thinking influences this work in some manner, it is important to note that the basis for all of this work rests within the contingency construct. Contingency constructs uphold the traditional linear thinking that aligns with these constructs and should not be confused with the perspective that is housed within that of interbehavioral psychology.

Section 2 Personal Reflection

What implications do you believe psychological events have on the study of complex human behaviors? How do you think future research can evolve surrounding the study of psychological events?

Section 2 Key Words

Interbehavioral psychology - system of psychology that focuses on the interactions between organisms and their environment, emphasizing the dynamic interplay of stimulus and response within a specific context

Section 3: Setting Conditions That Exist in Organizational Settings

Setting conditions may be comprised of different contextual factors. Contextual factors are the circumstances or conditions surrounding an event or situation that can influence or affect it. Some of these contextual factors can include the individual being tired or sick, the weather, or even different aspects of the organizational context (i.e., internal factors to the organization). The participation of setting conditions is important to keep in mind as the presence or absence of various setting conditions will result in an entirely different event. This means that adding or removing a setting factor will change the organization of other factors that make up the PE. In an effort to understand organizational behavior, setting conditions may include rules, regulations, and laws that are relevant to the organization. For example, a leader that is within an organization may decide to allocate either more or less of the budget that is completed annually to a specific department within the organization (i.e., custodial), which would then have various implications for other departments and their budgetary needs (i.e.,

marketing). Some of these changes that occur may be external to the particular organization. For example, an organization that receives funding from the government may be impacted by the different political efforts and regulations that occur within the world (i.e., placing restrictions on the work that receives funding).

Higher Education

Higher education is referred to as an institution that provides post-secondary instruction to individuals. These organizations are complex entities and consist of various setting conditions that participate in the behavior life of each individual that is involved in the organization.

Funding

Funding for higher education is paid for in a variety of ways and will differ from country to country, state to state, and institution to institution. For example, there are some higher institutions that exclusively rely on money from student tuition. The behavior of the individuals that are in these institutions are impacted by this particular setting condition. The administrators that are present in these institutions are tasked with determining the rate that should be charged for tuition since all aspects within the institution will be dependent on this rate. This will include the number of buildings that they will require for classes, the number of staff that will be required, how the staff will be paid, marketing costs, and so on. Additionally, this type of setting condition places an undue emphasis on increasing the numbers involved with enrollment. Increased enrollment will more than likely be encouraged. This particular example is different from organizations that depend on government funding or state tuition money. These setting conditions also have an impact on the behavior of the individuals that are involved.

Accreditation and Certification/Licensure Standards

There are several programs that have to contend with degree standards and requirements that are put forward by the university/college as well as from accreditation and certification/licensure boards. For example, there are some requirements outlined by accreditation bodies that determine the number of full-time faculty that have to be employed within a specific program. This type of requirement has different implications for the administrators at the university/college. Other standards may determine the faculty to student ratio that needs to be maintained within a program. Both the presence or the absence of these particular setting conditions have an impact on the behavior of the individuals that are involved in the educational organization. For example, faculty and students may not complete as high quality work in programs that require a higher student to faculty ratio within a program. On the other hand, a standard that is in place that requires a lower faculty to student ratio may help to prevent faculty members from being overburdened with course demands and allow them additional opportunities to focus on research and scholarship. As a result, this will have implications for the experiences of everyone involved including students, the program's reputation, and faculty.

It is important to also understand that accreditation and licensure/certification standards can have an impact on the information that is able to be taught within a specific program. This impact can affect the number of courses that are available as well as the specific content of each course. For example, programs that are centered around behavior analytic training have experienced several changes from certification boards throughout the years. These changes have had a resulting impact on the behavior of different individuals within these programs. For example, the different individuals that may have been impacted include administrators that have been involved in designing the curriculum, the faculty that are asked to teach the courses, as well as the students that are pursuing the

certification. When these particular conditions are more detailed and extensive, it results in less room for decisions to be made by individuals that are a part of the institution. Requirements that are extensive may act as a setting condition that prevents differentiation of programs within the field to occur. The rules and regulations that surround clinical supervision can also have implications for the individuals that are involved in training programs. For example, when a supervisor places a cap on the maximum number of individuals that are able to undergo group supervision at any one point in time, this will have an effect on the costs associated with providing that training, the work that is associated with the role of the supervisor, the experience that the supervisees will have, as well as other areas. While this is only a small number of examples that demonstrate the impact that accreditation and licensure/certification standards can have on behavior, it is important to note that the behavior of a multitude of individuals is impacted within the organization as well as the different training programs.

Rules and Regulations within Institutions

There are a variety of ways in which rules, regulations, and practices within organizations are able to act as setting conditions for behaviors that are associated with the workplace. For example, there are several implications that may be present that are associated with employee behavior. These examples include how the various resources are allocated as well as how an organization is able to respond to issues that occur from the outside sector. More importantly, these particular setting conditions may function at different levels. For example, a department within the organization may have a budget allocated for spending for the entire year. This budget may also require that the department decides how to spend the allocated money which may have an impact on the behavior of the employees. Other times, leaders within an organization will make decisions to allocate resources on their own and not include any input from other members of

the group. In other situations, though, decisions may be entirely made by those that are in the group and decisions may even be voted upon. The implications that exist within these different setting conditions can be far-reaching. For example, there may be individuals within an organization that may either be more or less interested in cutting costs associated with the organization if they have zero say in how the money is utilized once it has been saved. Furthermore, depending on the role that one has within an organization, there may be different perspectives held by individuals on how various decisions may have an impact on the group as time progresses, including neighboring groups and others.

It is important to note that setting factors are a vitally important area where future research and practice efforts should be directed within the field of OBM. Although some of the circumstances surrounding higher education have been referenced, there are still additional setting factors that are present that pertain to behavior analytic training programs. This even includes the area surrounding the job market for students in certain areas. The world is continually changing and with this necessitates the need for OBM to provide careful consideration of setting conditions. It may be beneficial to look at organizational behavior from the viewpoint of the PE.

Additionally, organizational practices may also be considered to be cultural in nature when evaluated from the interbehavioral perspective. This view emphasizes the participation of setting factors that are present within the evolution of different cultures. Researchers refer to cultural behavior as institutional stimulus-response functions that exist in which the responses with respect to the same stimulus objects are shared across several individuals and acquired under the group's endorsement and guidance (Kantor, 1982). As a result, interactions that occur among the different individuals not only participate within the various performances that occur in cultural behavior but also within the development. A group's endorsement and guidance is important as these help

with understanding the processes through which cultural behavior evolves. However, this endorsement and guidance is not limited to only those that operate from a psychological perspective, but others including perspectives from both sociological and anthropological mindsets.

As a result, it may be valuable to develop an interdisciplinary account of both organizational and cultural behavior that also advocates similarly as that from within behavior analysis (Mattaini, 2019). Therefore, behavior analysts should be cautious when considering interdisciplinary endeavors.

Interdisciplinary Science

An understanding of behavior that exists within organizational settings can also be informed through our understanding of the complexity that is present within interdisciplinary sciences. Behavior analysts can learn from other fields, such as sociology and economics, about behavior that is present within groups. The present perspective of many behavior analysts regarding interdisciplinary sciences lies within the information gathered from a few assumptions concerning interbehaviorism (Kantor, 1953). Disciplinary sciences separate themselves from other sciences by noting a unique feature that is present within the natural world to study. This can also be a unique relation that is present that one can study or focus upon. However, this implication does not mean that disciplinary subject matters are truly distinct from that of others in principle. The identification of a unique subject matter is noted as being an arbitrary procedure. Although this may be true, it is still an important step as it relates to the extent that a disciplinary science delineates an orientation to new material concerning the factors that comprise the world of natural occurrences. This process also includes the identification of subject matter boundary conditions, specifically those conditions that align with neighboring sciences, so that this avoids the collapse of all the

sciences into one. It is vital to note that something new may be developed from the disciplinary science which could be lost if the subject matter boundaries are not able to be maintained. The focus that one may have on something new has further implications for how interdisciplinary sciences are able to be conceptualized. As a result, interdisciplinary relationships that are genuine should involve the study of a relationship between at least two disciplinary subject matters. This would then be considered a new relationship and as such, interdisciplinary enterprises that are focused on these types of relationships may conclude with a discovery of something new and unique.

Although interdisciplinary sciences are not frequently conceptualized in this way, there are still several problematic conceptualizations of interdisciplinary science that may hinder the ability of these efforts that will result in the understanding of something new. For example, collaborative efforts, which consist of two disciplines that work together in a parallel manner, are able to be misconstrued as being interdisciplinary. Although additional disciplinary progress may be present within these arrangements, nothing new may emerge or at least nothing that is able to be considered interdisciplinary. On the other hand, some interdisciplinary efforts may consist of compromising a boundary condition of a participating science. When this occurs, something new can be learned about the material that is within the particular science but nothing may be gained in regard to the subject matter about the other science that is involved. As a result, the value of one of the disciplines is diminished while the overall relationship between the two sciences is that of helping as the other science is able to make progress.

These various arrangements exist for a multitude of reasons. For example, the participating disciplines may lack a sense of clarity as to the specific subject matter and how it aligns to the subject matter of different neighboring sciences. Furthermore, it may also be attributed to a failure to appreciate the cumulative nature that is associated with disciplinary sciences as well as a misunderstanding

of disciplinary sciences in a general sense. This does not suggest that interdisciplinary sciences are problematic in regards to principle. Instead, this suggests that interdisciplinary sciences are able to be pursued so that new discoveries are unable to be made. These concerns are important to note and consider as interdisciplinary research and practice is continued to be pursued (Hayes & Fryling, 2009).

Section 3 Personal Reflection

What are some examples of various contextual factors that impact your job performance? By changing one of these factors that you have listed, how would that impact your future job performance?

Section 3 Key Words

Collaborative efforts - consist of two disciplines that work together in a parallel manner

Contextual factors - circumstances or conditions surrounding an event or situation that can influence or affect it.

Interdisciplinary relationship - involve the study of a relationship between at least two disciplinary subject matters

References

- Ardila Sánchez, J.G., Houmanfar, R.A., & Alavosius, M.P. (2019). A descriptive analysis of the effects of weather disasters on community resilience. *Behavior and Social Issues*, 28(1), 298–315. doi: 10.1007/s42822-019-00015-w
- Alvero, A.M., Bucklin, B.R., & Austin, J. (2001). An objective review of the effectiveness and essential characteristics of performance feedback in organizational settings. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 21, 3–29. doi:10.1300/J075v21n01_02
- Baia, F.H. & Sampaio, A.A.S. (2019). Distinguishing units of analysis, procedures, and processes in cultural selection: Notes on metacontingency terminology. *Behavior and Social Issues*, 28(1), 204–220. doi: 10.1007/s42822-019-00017-8
- Dickinson, A.M. (2001). The historical roots of organizational behavior management in the private sector: The 1950s–1980s. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 3–4, 9–58. doi: 10.1300/J075v20n03_02
- DiGennaro Reed, F.D., Henley, A.J., Rueb, S., Crabbs, B., & Giacalone, L. (2016). Discussion of behavioral principles in Journal of Organizational Behavior Management: An update. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 36(2–3), 202–209. doi: 10.1080/01608061.2016.1200938
- Elliott, A.J., Morgan, K., Fuqua, R.W., Ehrhardt, K., & Poling, A. (2005). Self- and cross-citations in the Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis and the Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior: 1993–2003. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 38, 559–563. doi: 10.1901/jaba.2005.133-04

- Fryling, M. J. & Hayes, L. J. (2010). An interbehavioral analysis of memory. *European Journal of Behavior Analysis*, 11, 53-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15021149.2010.11434334>
- Fryling, M.J. & Hayes, L.J. (2011). The concept of function in the analysis of behavior. *Mexican Journal of Behavior Analysis*, 37, 11-20. doi: 10.5514/rmac.v37.i1.24686
- Fryling, M.J. & Hayes, L.J. (2018). J.R. Kantor and behavior analysis. *Conductual*, 6, 86-94. <http://conductual.com/articulos/J.%20R.%20Kantor%20and%20Behavior%20Analysis.pdf>
- Glenn, S.S. (1988). Contingencies and metacontingencies: Toward a synthesis of behavior analysis and cultural materialism. *The Behavior Analyst*, 11(2), 161-179. doi: 10.1007/BF03392470
- Glenn, S.S. (2004). Individual behavior, culture, and social change. *The Behavior Analyst*, 27, 133-151. doi: 10.1007/BF03393175
- Glenn, S.S. (2010). Metacontingencies, selection, and OBM: Comments on "Emergence and metacontingency." *Behavior and Social Issues*, 19(1), 104-110. doi: 10.5210/bsi.v19i0.3220
- Glenn, S.S., Malott, M.E., Andery, M.A.P.A., Benvenuti, M., Houmanfar, R.A., Sandaker, I., Todorov, J.C., Tourinho, E.Z., & Vasconcelos, L.A. (2016). Toward consistent terminology in a behaviorist approach to cultural analysis. *Behavior and Social Issues*, 25(1), 11-27. doi: 10.5210/bsi.v25i0.6634
- Gravina, N.E., Loewy, S., Rice, A., & Austin, J. (2013). Evaluating behavioral self-monitoring with accuracy training for changing computer work postures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 33(1), 68-76. doi:10.1080/01608061.2012.729397

- Gravina, N., Villacorta, J., Albert, K., Clark, R., Curry, S., & Wilder, D. (2018). A literature Review of organizational behavior management interventions in human service settings From 1990–2016. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 2–3, 194–224. doi: 10.1080/01608061.2018.1454872
- Hayes, L.J., Dubuque, E.M., Fryling, M.J., & Pritchard, J.K. (2009). A behavioral systems analysis of behavior analysis as a scientific system. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 29(3/4), 315–332. doi: 10.1080/01608060903092169
- Hayes, L.J. & Fryling, M.J. (2009). Toward an interdisciplinary science of culture. *The Psychological Record*, 59, 679–700. doi: 10.1007/BF03395687
- Hayes, L. J., & Fryling, M. J. (2014) Motivation in behavior analysis: A critique. *The Psychological Record*, 64, 339–347. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40732-014-0025-z>
- Hayes, S.C., Bond, F.W., Barnes-Holmes, D., & Austin, J. (2006). *Acceptance and mindfulness at work: Applying Acceptance and Commitment Therapy and Relational Frame Theory to Organizational Behavior Management*. Taylor & Frances.
- Houmanfar, R., A., Alavosius, M.P., Morford, Z.H., Herbst, S.A., & Reimer, D. (2015). Functions of organizational leaders in cultural change: Financial and social well-being. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 35(1–2), 4–27. doi: 10.1080/01608061.2015.1035827
- Houmanfar, R., Rodrigues, N.J., & Smith, G.S. (2009). Role of communication networks in behavioral systems analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 29(3), 257–275. doi: 10.1080/01608060903092102

- Houmanfar, R., Rodrigues, N.J., & Ward, T.A. (2010). Emergence and metacontingency: Points of contact and departure. *Behavior and Social Issues*, 19(1), 78–103.
- Hunter, C.S. (2012). Analyzing behavioral and cultural selection contingencies. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 44(1), 43–54.
- Kantor, J.R. (1953). *The logic of modern science*. Principia Press.
- Kantor, J.R. (1958). *Interbehavioral psychology*. Principia Press.
- Kantor, J.R. (1982). *Cultural psychology*. Principia Press.
- Malott, M.E. (2003). *Paradox of organizational change: Engineering organizations with behavioral systems analysis*. Context Press.
- Mattaini, M.A. (2019). Out of the lab: Shaping an ecological and constructional cultural systems science. *Perspectives on Behavior Science*, 42, 713–731. doi: 10.1007/s40614-019-00208-z
- Moore, J. & Cooper, J.O. (2003). Some proposed relations among the domains of behavior analysis. *The Behavior Analyst*, 26, 69–84. doi: 10.1007/BF03392068
- Moran, D.J. (2015). Acceptance and Commitment Training in the workplace. *Current Opinion In Psychology*, 2, 26–31. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2014.12.031
- Normand, M., Bucklin, B., & Austin, J. (1999). The discussion of behavioral principles in JOBM. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 19(3), 45–56. doi: 10.1300/J075v19n03_04
- Poling, A., Alling, K., & Fuqua, R.W. (1994). Self-and cross-citations in the Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis and the Journal of the Experimental Analysis of

Behavior: 1983–1992. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 27, 729–731.
doi: 10.1901/jaba.1994.27-729

Soares, P.F.R., Martins, J.C.T., Guimarães, T.M.M., Leite, F.L., & Tourinho, E.Z.
(2019). Effects of continuous and intermittent cultural consequences on
culturants in metacontingency concurrent with operant contingency.
Behavior and Social Issues, 28(1), 189–202. doi: 10.1007/
s42822-019-00009-8

Tadaiesky, L. T. & Tourinho, E. Z. (2012). Effects of support consequences and
cultural consequences on the selection of interlocking behavioral
contingencies. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 44(1), 133– 147.

Tittelbach, D., Deangelis, M., Sturmey, P., & Alvero, A. M. (2007). The effects of
task clarification, feedback, and goal setting on student advisors' office
behaviors and customer service. *Journal of Organizational Behavior
Management*, 27(3), 27–40. doi: 10.1300/J075v27n03_03

VanStelle, S.E., Vicars, S.M., Harr, V., Miguel, C.F., Koerber, J.L., Kazbour, R., &
Austin, J. (2012). Publication history of the *Journal of Organizational
Behavior Management*: An objective review and analysis: 1998–2009.
Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 32, 93–123. doi:
10.1080/01608061.2012.675864

Zilio, D. (2019). On the function of science: An overview of 30 years of publications
on metacontingency. *Behavior and Social Issues*, 28, 46–76. doi: 10.1007/
s42822-019-00006-x



The material contained herein was created by EdCompass, LLC ("EdCompass") for the purpose of preparing users for course examinations on websites owned by EdCompass, and is intended for use only by users for those exams. The material is owned or licensed by EdCompass and is protected under the copyright laws of the United States and under applicable international treaties and conventions. Copyright 2025 EdCompass. All rights reserved. Any reproduction, retransmission, or republication of all or part of this material is expressly prohibited, unless specifically authorized by EdCompass in writing.