*SEVERE CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS:
TEACHERS OR COUNSELLORS*

ROY H. MARLOWE,¹ CHARLES H. MADSEN, JR., CHARLES E. BOWEN,
ROBERT C. REARDON, AND PATRICK E. LOGUE

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY,
AND DUKE UNIVERSITY MEDICAL SCHOOL

This experiment was designed to determine the relative effectiveness of teacher and counselling approaches in the reduction of disruptive or inappropriate classroom behavior. Inappropriate classroom behavior frequencies of 12 academically low achieving, seventh-grade, black male students, with a reported high rate of inappropriate classroom behavior, were recorded. Three groups, with nearly equal mean inappropriate behaviors, were randomly assigned to one of three treatment conditions: behavioral counselling, client-centered counselling, or no counselling. Each counselling group received fifteen 30-minute counselling sessions, at a rate of two to three times a week. In addition to counselling, all students subsequently received teacher approval within the classroom. Results indicated that the teacher was able to reduce inappropriate behavior more than any counselling group. There were also indications that behavioral counselling, but not client-centered counselling, was moderately helpful in reducing inappropriate classroom behavior.

DESCRIPTORS: classroom behavior, classroom management, disruptive behavior, behavioral counselling, client-centered counselling, approval, token program, teacher behavior, teacher training, teachers, students

Two basically divergent counselling approaches conducted outside the classroom have been developed to help solve classroom problems. One approach, client-centered counselling, is based on personal insight and decision making. A second approach, behavioral counselling, utilizes the principles and techniques of behavior modification.

Client-centered counselling is primarily concerned with helping the client to be responsible and capable of making decisions (Rogers, 1951). A major goal of client-centered counselling is to facilitate client "self-insight" generally, through the counsellor-client relationship (Kemp, 1967).

The implicit assumption is made that following treatment the clients will alter their inappropriate behavior in the classroom, as it will no longer be necessary.

Investigators using client-centered counselling have reported many successes, usually on the basis of self-reports. Many other studies have not yielded such favorable results. Alper and Kranzler (1970) stated that "despite the widespread use of client-centered therapy in training and treatment, evidence concerning the efficacy of this approach is lacking". In addition, research dealing specifically with a client-centered approach in a school setting has been infrequent. It has been reported that the school counsellor who attempts to use Rogerian counselling theory in the school generally experiences much anxiety as "a number of Rogerian tenets are out of place in the school, and so are the counsellors who rigidly adhere to them" (Ciaverella, 1972, p. 114.).

In most cases, client-centered counselling has been ineffective when used with a student popu-

¹Portions of this paper were a part of the senior author's doctoral dissertation at Florida State University. We wish gratefully to acknowledge the help and support of Wakulla County instructional personnel. We are very indebted to the young men who made this study possible and who hopefully acquired some of the joys of learning. Reprints may be obtained from Charles H. Madsen, Jr., Department of Psychology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306.

lation (Andrews, 1971; Raph, Goldberg, and Passow, 1966). One group of investigators who reported success (Asbury and Winston, 1974) found that although school counsellors using a client-centered or Rogerian approach had made gains with their student clients, the approach was even more beneficial when combined with behavioristic principles (*e.g.*, selective reinforcement of responses).

Many studies have used behavior modification principles in classrooms (Barrish, Saunders, and Wolf, 1969; Hall, Lund, and Jackson, 1968; Madsen, Becker, and Thomas, 1968; McLaughlin and Malaby, 1972, 1975, 1976; O'Leary and Becker, 1967; O'Leary and O'Leary, 1976). However, relatively few behavioral researchers (McAllister, Stachowiak, Baer, and Conderman, 1969; McCullough, 1972; McSween, Note 1; Meyer, Strowig, and Hosford, 1970) have conducted studies with junior high-school students.

In behavioral counselling, the school counsellor employs the principles of applied behavior analysis (Bijou, 1966; Krumboltz, 1966; Mayer, Rohen, and Whitley, 1969). Evidence indicates that the behavioral approach is a more efficient form of counselling and more preferred by the client in comparison to client-centered and psychoanalytic approaches (Holen and Kinsey, 1975).

Questions, however, have arisen concerning the durability of the behavioral approach. Gumaer and Myrick (1974) reported that counsellors were able to reduce disruptive behavior through group behavioral counselling outside the classroom. Reports from teachers who completed pre- and postgroup behavioral checklists suggested that there was a transfer of appropriate behavior to the classroom. However, it became evident that the increased appropriate classroom behavior was temporary. Students' disruptive behavior gradually returned to its original level about 10 weeks after the study. Similar criticisms concerning the ineffectiveness of out-of-the-classroom behavioral counselling in modifying inappropriate classroom behaviors have been expressed in other studies (Madsen,

Madsen, and Driggs, 1971; Madsen and Madsen, 1974).

The purpose of the present study was to ascertain whether different types of counselling outside the classroom, or teacher approval within the classroom, with the counsellor serving as a behavioral consultant, would be more effective in changing the students' inappropriate classroom behavior.

METHOD

Subjects and Setting

Subjects were 12 male seventh-grade pupils attending a public high school in northwest Florida. The subjects constituted the fourth lowest of five academic achievement groups. The one lower section was classified as educable retarded. Ages ranged from 12 to 16 yr. Four subjects had been retained in a previous elementary grade for at least 1 yr. Intelligence quotient scores were below the national norm, and national achievement test scores ranged from the first to the fifth percentile level.

The subjects were selected from a classroom of 30 because of their high rate of inappropriate classroom behavior, as reported by the teacher and school principal. Cumulative personal records revealed that, without exception, each subject was considered a problem student by his former sixth-grade teacher, *e.g.*, "lazy", "needs strong discipline", and "needs special care".

Teacher and Counsellor

Miss B was a cooperative and intelligent teacher in her first year of public teaching. She taught health and was extremely cooperative throughout the study.

The counsellor was a 25-yr-old male with an MA in guidance and counselling. To control for variables such as personality and background differences, the same counsellor was used in both the behavioral and client-centered counselling groups. At the master's degree level, he had acquired theoretical and practical training in client-centered counselling and had completed

two advanced courses in the theoretical and practical application of behavior modification techniques to classrooms.

Teacher Trainer and Observers

The teacher trainer was a second-year doctoral student in counsellor education at The Florida State University. He also served as the principal classroom observer during the experiment. Three additional reliability observers, who were graduate students in psychology, were used after being trained in the observation method.

Behavior Categories

Students were rated either on- or off-task (appropriate or inappropriate for the situation). If the observed student was off-task during any fractional part of an interval, he was off-task.

Teacher behavior during any one interval was classified as either (1) academic approval, (2) academic disapproval, (3) social approval, (4) social disapproval, (5) a mistake or inappropriate use of one of the above four behaviors, or (6) no approval or disapproval behavior observed (Madsen and Madsen, 1974). The "no behavior observed" category was counted only when no approval or disapproval behavior was observed during the entire interval.

Observation Procedures

The day before observations began, the teacher announced to the class that one or more persons would be sitting in the classroom every day for the rest of the school year, but not to pay any attention to them because they were completing a university requirement of observing student-teacher interactions. She emphasized that the observers were not reporting anything to the principal and what they did had nothing to do with class grades.

Timed observations of the students and the teacher were normally conducted in the fifth period each school day throughout the experi-

ment (March to May). Each subject was observed approximately 1 min of every 12 or 20 min of observation per week. The instructor was observed simultaneously with each subject so that her observed time totalled 4 hr for one week.

All observations used five consecutive 10-sec intervals followed by a 10-sec break for recording any comments. Each day, student observation order was randomly rearranged. During each 10-sec interval, the student being observed was recorded as being engaged in appropriate (on-task) or inappropriate (off-task) behavior.

Experimental Conditions and Procedure

Procedures included a combination group and individual study (Baer, Wolf, and Risley, 1968; Barton, Guess, Garcia, and Baer, 1970). The design consisted of six experimental conditions, with each of three groups going through each condition, although the control group received no counselling during the study. The length of each condition was determined by: (1) total school days available, and (2) the time felt necessary to obtain an accurate estimate of the efficacy of a treatment.

The six experimental conditions included baseline, counselling, counselling plus teacher attention, counselling plus teacher attention plus token reinforcement, baseline₂, and teacher attention plus token reinforcement. The study was begun the first week of March and completed the last week of May.

Baseline. During baseline (10 days), no experimental conditions were introduced. Data were collected on the normal classroom behavior of students and the teacher. At the end of baseline, students were matched on the basis of their average inappropriate behavior and grouped in fours, so each group had the same mean off-task frequency. These three groups were randomly assigned to one of three treatments: behavioral counselling, client-centered, or no contact control. Each of the three groups consisted of four boys with the following off-

task averages: behavioral counselling 54.8%, client-centered counselling 59.2%, and no contact control 55.3%.

Counselling. During Condition 2 (18 days), eight 30-min counselling sessions were conducted for the behavioral counselling and client-centered counselling groups (counselling continued throughout the first four conditions of the study for a total of 15 sessions for each group).

The behavioral counselling group received behavior modification techniques, such as approval for positive behavior, ignoring inappropriate behavior, and setting specific and measurable goals. The counsellor controlled the counselling session, teaching the students how to correct themselves when they behaved inappropriately and to credit themselves when they behaved appropriately, and emphasizing student responsibility (on-task behavior). This last point was the primary focus of counselling.

The client-centered counselling group followed client-centered principles, such as development of a warm, friendly relationship, maintenance of respect for the students' ability to solve their own problems, and acceptance of the students. Emphasis was placed on the counsellor-client relationship and respect for the student as an individual person. This group was instructed in responsibility for their own decisions and focused on obtaining "insight" into the reasons for their inappropriate behavior.

During Condition 2, the no contact control group continued baseline, without treatment.

Counselling plus teacher attention. During Condition 3 (five days), every subject (in all three groups) received teacher attention contingent on rule following. The basic teacher attention approach was similar to that used by Madsen, Becker, and Thomas (1968), *i.e.*, emphasized key classroom rules, highly praised appropriate student behaviors, and generally ignored negative behaviors. Each day the teacher, Miss B, stressed the following five classroom rules: (1) if you need to talk, talk softly; (2) sit quietly; (3) raise your hand to get the

teacher's attention; (4) be prepared—bring pencil and notebook; and (5) use the hall pass only in an emergency. She reinforced appropriate behavior (academic and social) with both words and gestures, and generally ignored inappropriate behavior (Madsen and Madsen, 1974). The behavioral counselling and client-centered counselling groups continued to receive counselling sessions during Condition 3.

Counselling plus teacher attention plus token reinforcement. Condition 4 (seven days) was a continuation of Condition 3, with the additional treatment of token reinforcement for all students. Appropriate classroom behavior was reinforced with a token, each token worth one-fourth of a doughnut or one ounce of soda pop and redeemable on Friday of each week. Inappropriate behavior, such as motor-off-task (walking around the room), was ignored, except when it endangered a student, the teacher, or property. Focus was on the positive student behaviors.

Baseline₂. Condition 5 (four days) was a return to baseline, and was brief because the teacher expressed concern that the students might "revert to their old ways".

Teacher attention plus token reinforcement. Condition 6 (eight days) was similar to Condition 4, but without concurrent counselling sessions for the behavioral counselling and client-centered counselling groups. During this final condition, Miss B re-instated the basic classroom rules, focused on approval following appropriate behavior, and ignored inappropriate behaviors. Consequences included words, gestures, and token reinforcement for appropriate behaviors.

In summary, Conditions 1 and 5 were similar baseline conditions; Condition 2 contrasted the effects of counselling with noncounselling; Condition 3 compared teacher attention with and without counselling; Condition 4 looked at the effects of an additional variable, token reinforcement; and Condition 6 examined the impact of teacher attention and token reinforcement without the concurrent exposure of counselling on student off-task behavior.

Reliability

Reliability scores were computed for each of the teacher and student behaviors observed. Agreements were counted when identical behaviors were scored in the same interval. Inter-judge reliability was computed by dividing the sum of interval agreements by the sum of interval agreements plus interval disagreements for the observed period. Three different reliability observers were used after being trained in the observation method. Average reliability scores ranged from 0.90 to 0.99, with an overall mean of 0.95 for student on- and off-task behavior. Average reliability for teacher approval-disapproval, mistakes of approval-disapproval, and no approval-disapproval behavior observed varied from 0.72 to 1.00, with an overall mean of 0.91. The combined average reli-

ability score for teacher plus student behavior was 0.93. (Reliability was obtained for 20% of all observations spread across all conditions of the study (Figure 3).

Videotapes were made of two behavioral and two client-centered counselling sessions in order to verify that the counsellor was implementing appropriate principles in each type of counselling session. Behavior modification and client-centered checklists were given to five individuals who rated the sessions. Rating sheets consisted of two sets of eight statements, with a scale from one (low) to five (high), one set relevant to client-centered counselling techniques, the other to behavioral counselling techniques (Table 1).

When all five rater scores were averaged by counselling session, item by item, and all eight item scores combined and averaged to give one

Table 1
Ratings of Counselling Sessions

	<i>Behavioral Videotapes</i>		<i>Client-Centered Videotapes</i>	
	1	2	1	2
BEHAVIORAL RATING ITEMS:				
1. Reinforcing appropriate verbal responses with immediate praise.	4.0	5.0	1.2	1.2
2. Reinforcing appropriate motor responses with immediate praise.	3.3	2.8	1.3	1.0
3. Emphasizing adherence to rules.	4.4	4.6	2.2	1.4
4. Using individuals and/or group to role-play problem situations.	4.4	1.2	1.0	1.0
5. Providing motor and/or verbal examples of appropriate behaviors.	4.4	2.2	1.2	1.0
6. Having students verbalize the contingencies.	3.0	4.2	2.0	1.6
7. Paying adequate attention to the problems of each individual student.	3.0	3.8	4.0	3.2
8. Relating counselling activities to the students' classroom and teacher.	4.6	4.6	3.2	2.8
Average of five raters	3.9	3.6	2.0	1.7
CLIENT-CENTERED RATING ITEMS:				
1. Development of a warm, friendly relationship with the students.	3.8	4.2	3.8	3.8
2. Acceptance of the students exactly as they are.	2.6	3.0	4.2	4.4
3. Reflection of feelings.	1.3	3.2	4.2	3.4
4. Maintenance of respect for the students' ability to solve their own problems.	3.2	3.0	4.0	3.4
5. Allowing counselling to proceed at the pace the students choose.	2.0	2.6	4.4	4.6
6. Establishment of only those limitations that are necessary to anchor counselling to the world of reality and to make the students aware of their responsibility in the relationship.	2.2	3.0	3.6	4.0
7. Counsellor is himself and does not present a facade.	4.2	4.0	3.4	4.0
8. Counsellor is sensitive to current feelings in the relationship and verbally communicates this sensitivity to the students.	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.4
	2.8	3.3	3.9	3.9

mean score per videotape, the two behavioral counselling videotapes received ratings of 3.9 and 3.6 on the behavior modification items. The two client-centered counselling videotapes received ratings of 3.9 and 3.9 on the client-centered items. A score of 3.0 was accepted as sufficient indication that a minimum level of the appropriate counselling technique was implemented.

RESULTS

The behavioral counselling group's inappropriate behavior was reduced 6.8% during counselling. During counselling plus teacher attention, mean off-task behavior dropped another 38.1%, and when token reinforcement was added to behavioral counselling and teacher attention, inappropriate behavior decreased an additional 7.8%. Baseline₂ resulted in a mean

increase of 34.8% in inappropriate behavior from the previous condition. However, the final condition (teacher attention plus token reinforcement) reduced the behavior 34.0% (Figure 1).

The behavioral counselling group had the following percentages of off-task behavior: baseline—54.8%, counselling—48.0%, counselling plus attention—9.9%, counselling plus attention plus tokens—2.1%, baseline₂—36.9%, and attention plus tokens—2.9%. The behavioral counselling group had a tendency to reduce its inappropriate behavior sooner and more durably than either the client-centered counselling or no-contact control group (Figure 1). Statistical analysis (chi-square approximation following Kruskal-Wallis analysis of ranks) indicates that during all treatment conditions, the behavioral counselling group was significantly lower in off-task behavior than either the client-centered or no-contact control groups, chi square (10 *df*) = 3.50, $p < 0.05$.

Fig. 1. Average frequency of off-task behavior: behavioral counselling (N = 4), client-centered counselling (N = 4), and no-contact control (N = 4).

The client-centered group reduced average off-task behavior from 59.2% during baseline, to 57.0% in counselling, with a 27.7 mean per cent off-task behavior decrease when teacher attention was added, and another 10.8% average reduction with the addition of tokens. During baseline, inappropriate classroom behavior increased 29.7%, with a final drop of 38.2% during the final condition (Figure 1).

During counselling, there was a consistent drop in inappropriate behavior for the client-centered counselling group after approximately two-thirds (six sessions) of the client-centered counselling treatment time had elapsed. Teacher attention further decreased the behavior that was reduced to a minimum when token reinforcement was added. (Mean off-task frequencies: baseline—59.2%, counselling—57.0%, counselling plus teacher attention—29.3%, counselling plus teacher attention plus tokens—18.5%, baseline₂—48.2%, attention plus tokens—10.0%) (Figure 1).

The no-contact control group, which received no counselling, actually increased mean off-task behavior during counselling, 55.3% to 66.0%. When teacher attention was introduced, the off-task behavior decreased from 66.0% to 25.3%. Teacher attention plus token reinforcement reduced inappropriate behavior another 5.9%. During baseline₂, when teacher attention and token reinforcement were eliminated, inappropriate behavior of the no-contact control group rose to 38.6%. During the final condition, teacher attention plus token reinforcement, the group's off-task behavior decreased to a low of 7.5%.

When reductions among all three treatment groups were compared after three weeks of counselling, the client-centered group had a 2.2% reduction. The behavioral group had a 6.8% decrease. The no-contact control group, however, increased off-task behavior by 10% during the same period. The effect of teacher attention (Condition 3) was approximately a 40% reduction in off-task behavior across all groups. When the initial effects of the first treat-

ment received by each group were compared (*i.e.*, behavioral counselling and client-centered counselling compared to teacher attention), the following reduction in inappropriate behavior was noted: behavioral counselling decreased inappropriate behavior by 6.8%, client-centered counselling by 2.2%, and teacher attention by 40.7% (Figure 1). During the three teacher attention or teacher attention plus token reinforcement conditions (3, 4, and 6), the no-counselling group maintained an equal or lower mean off-task frequency than the client-centered group. During the conditions in which behavioral counselling was implemented concurrently with the teacher attention and teacher attention plus token reinforcement (3 and 4), the off-task frequency remained approximately 17% lower than for either of the other two groups (Figure 1).

Counselling did not decrease mean inappropriate student behavior when compared to initial observation (57.0% for counselling *versus* 56.4% for baseline); however, when the teacher attention variable was included during counselling plus teacher attention, inappropriate behavior (student off-task) dropped 35.7% (Figure 2). When token reinforcement was added to counselling plus teacher attention, the mean off-task behavior dropped from 21.3% to 13.4%. There was an average decrease in inappropriate or off-task behavior of 43% from baseline (Condition 1) to counselling plus teacher attention plus tokens (Condition 4). Following a return to baseline (Condition 5), when teacher attention plus token reinforcement was again instituted (Condition 6), the lowest mean off-task frequency of any condition was observed. The final 6.8% off-task frequency (average) was approximately 50, 50, 15, 7, and 34% lower than the other conditions (Figure 2).

A finding noted in all phases of the study was the inverse relationship between the teacher approval ratio (approval divided by approval plus mistakes) and student off-task behavior (Figures 2 and 3). Whenever teacher approval (teacher attention that focuses on positive stu-

Fig. 2. A comparison of mean student off-task frequency ($N = 12$) with teacher academic approval and social approval ratios, by condition.

student behaviors) was low (Conditions 1, 2, and 5), student off-task behavior was high; conversely, with high teacher approval (Conditions 3, 4, and 6) student inappropriate classroom behavior was low. When total teacher approval was analyzed into both social and academic approval, it was found that social and academic approval were somewhat different across conditions (Figure 2). Daily computation of social approval, academic approval, and student off-task behavior indicated that social approval, rather than academic approval, was the teacher behavior that consistently varied inversely with student off-task behavior (Figure 2). Academic approval appeared to promote an erratic pattern. When a breakdown of approval behavior was computed, it was found that 17% of all teacher approving behavior was academic, the remaining social. During the conditions when teacher attention was not intended to reinforce appropriate on-task behavior, most of the teacher

approval was academic. Therefore, social approval seemed to be the major variable that produced the change during the teacher attention conditions.

From the beginning of the study to the last condition, the mean student off-task behavior frequency decreased from a high of 56.4% to a low of 6.8%; during the same period, the teacher social approval ratio increased from a low of 3.0% to a high of 91.1%.

All subjects reduced inappropriate classroom behavior when baseline was compared to counselling plus teacher attention. The individual decrease varied from 11.7% to 59.3%, with a mean decrease of 35.1% (Figures 4, 5, and 6). All 12 students increased off-task behavior from the previous conditions when baseline₂ was implemented. There was an average off-task behavior decrease of 27.8% When teacher attention plus token reinforcement was used without counselling (Condition 6), off-task behavior dropped

Fig. 3. A comparison of mean student off-task frequency ($N = 12$) with teacher overall approval ratios, by day.

sharply for each student. Frequencies of off-task behavior ranged from 0.0% to 13.6%, with a mean of 6.8% (Figures 4, 5, and 6).

DISCUSSION

When the teacher used teacher attention techniques without token reinforcement, all 12 students in the study reduced their off-task behavior. The total mean reduction of off-task behavior from the nonexperimental baseline condition was approximately 35%. The reduction of off-task behavior frequency is consistent with previous studies of the effects of teacher attention on students' behavior (e.g., Hasazi and Hasazi, 1972; Hall, Lund, and Jackson, 1968; Hardiman, Goetz, Reuter, and LeBlanc, 1975; Thomas, Becker, and Armstrong, 1968). It seems apparent that teacher attention alone, without prior or concurrent counselling experience, was able sharply to reduce student off-task behavior.

Teacher attention combined with token reinforcement further reduced off-task behavior. This finding is consistent with numerous token reinforcement studies (i.e., Bushell, Wrobell, and Michaelis, 1968; McLaughlin, 1975; McLaughlin and Malaby, 1972, 1975, 1976; Wolf, Giles, and Hall, 1968).

The clearest support for the effectiveness of teacher attention and token reinforcement in this classroom was found in the group that received only behavioral techniques in the classroom. Before teacher attention, the four students were "acting-out" about 62% of the time. When Miss B praised them for doing "good things" and ignored negative behavior, these students increased their positive on-task behavior to a 75% average. During a seven-day period when the students were rewarded with tokens for being on task, appropriate behavior increased to over 80%. During a four-day period when the teacher failed to implement positive reinforce-

BEHAVIORAL

Fig. 4. Frequency of individual off-task behavior for behavioral counselling group, by day and condition.

CLIENT CENTERED

Fig. 5. Frequency of individual off-task behavior for client-centered counselling group, by day and condition.

ment techniques, "catch them being good", inappropriate behavior increased to over 38%. The last finding—an increase of off-task behavior when teacher attention was temporarily discontinued—provides strong support for the hypothesis that teacher attention was the primary

variable in this study that reduced off-task behavior. Finally, during an eight-day period, when Miss B again implemented positive teacher attention techniques, including token rewards, the students reduced their inappropriate behavior and increased mean appropriate behavior to over 92% of the time.

The importance of positive teacher attention is substantiated by the fact that on the days the teacher failed to show her approval for appropriate student behavior, particularly approval for appropriate social behavior, students' inappropriate behavior either increased or remained high. Conversely, the more approval Miss B gave, the less "rowdy" behavior occurred.

There is an indication that behavioral counselling did tend to decrease the students' inappropriate classroom behavior. During the counselling condition, although mean off-task behavior dropped less than 7%, three of the four subjects in the behavioral counselling group decreased off-task classroom behavior. Two other findings indicate that behavioral counselling improved the students' class behavior. First, it was found that after a week of counselling, the students displayed a moderate drop in off-task behavior. This lower level remained stable through the rest of the counselling condition. Second, during the counselling plus teacher attention conditions, these students were at least 15% lower in off-task behavior than either of the other two groups. It would appear that behavioral counselling in conjunction with positive teacher attention principles was especially effective in reducing inappropriate behavior. During the teacher attention conditions, those who had received behavioral counselling were observed on-task at a higher level than either of the other two groups.

These findings suggest that the behavioral counselling experience helped prepare the students for the teacher attention techniques later implemented. When the teacher used these techniques, the behavioral group immediately reduced off-task behavior, and it remained at a low level; the other two groups gradually reduced their off-task behavior. There is some evidence that generalization of learning did occur from the behavioral counselling setting to the classroom.

Client-centered counselling did not seem to decrease the students' inappropriate classroom behavior. During the counselling condition, two

Fig. 6. Frequency of individual off-task behavior for no-contact control group, by day and condition.

of the four subjects decreased their off-task behavior (mean reduction from baseline—2%). Through all treatment phases, including the four-day period when no counselling or teacher techniques were employed, the client-centered counselling group followed an off-task pattern similar to the no-contact control group, and was

consistently higher than the behavioral counselling groups.

Following approximately two-thirds of counselling experience, the client-centered and no-contact control subjects evidenced a moderate decrease in inappropriate behavior. This drop might have been due to factors other than counselling; perhaps the decrease could result from modelling the four students in the behavioral group.

The evidence supports the likelihood that short-term behavioral counselling (which takes an active role in trying to create client change), rather than short-term client-centered counselling, may reduce inappropriate classroom behavior. This is consistent with a study of McMullin (1970), which found that when the counsellor offered suggestions or directions the client might pursue, the client reported higher self-exploring or inward probing of feelings and experiences. McMullin suggested that it might be more useful for the counsellor to become actively involved in client change, rather than waiting for an atmosphere conducive to change to develop.

It was found that teacher attention plus token reinforcement resulted in a greater decrease of off-task behavior than teacher attention excluding token reinforcement. Token reinforcement may serve as a catalyst to accelerate decreases in inappropriate behavior similar to behavioral counselling. The tokens increased the approval ratio and one of their most important functions is probably to serve as reminders to the teacher to give approval. In fact, instruction was given to the teacher during this condition to increase the number of tokens given and to pair them with explicit behavioral explanations as to why the student received the token.

Perhaps the most important practical implication derived from this study is the feasibility of using the counsellor as a consultant to teachers (and to parents). Other studies (Lauver, 1974; Palmo and Kuzniar, 1972) have reported that counsellor consultation with teachers and parents of children exhibiting classroom adjustment problems was a more effective means of

dealing with the problem than out-of-the-classroom group counselling.

The present study suggests that counsellors should assume the role of teacher consultant in order to provide the most efficient means of changing student classroom behavior. Although it should not be implied that counsellors should abandon their responsibility for dealing with various other personal or group counselling problems, certainly this approach would at least allow counsellors to produce a greater impact on student classroom behaviors. The results clearly indicate the overall effect of teacher attention following consultation as more effective than group counselling (Figure 3).

Further research is needed to focus on critical problems other than classroom discipline, both to learn more about the utility of counsellor consultation and the generalizability of positive teacher attention. In addition, since only one therapist was used in the present study, future research should determine whether other therapists could achieve the same results. There may have been an interaction between the therapist's orientation and the outcome of the study. Evidence from this study and others indicates that it might be useful to train counsellors in behavior modification techniques, regardless of their theoretical counselling orientation.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. McMullen, R. E. *Differential effects of the manipulation of counselor attitudes and counselor suggestions on self-experiencing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1970.
2. McSween, T. *A behavior modification group for high school students*. Paper presented at the First Annual Convention, Midwestern Association of Behavior Analysis, May 1-3, 1975, Chicago, Illinois.

REFERENCES

- Alper, T. G. and Kranzler, G. D. A comparison of the effectiveness of behavioral and client-centered approaches for behavior problems of elementary school children. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, 1970, 5, 35-43.

- Andrews, W. R. Behavioral and client-centered counseling of high school underachievers. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1971, 18, 93-96.
- Asbury, F. R. and Winston, R. B. Reinforcing self-exploration and problem solving. *School Counselor*, 1974, 21, 204-209.
- Baer, D. M., Wolf, M. M., and Risley, T. R. Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1968, 1, 91-97.
- Barrish, H., Saunders, M., and Wolf, M. M. Good behavior game: effects of individual contingencies and group consequences on disruptive behavior in a classroom. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1969, 2, 119-124.
- Barton, E. S., Guess, D., Garcia, E., and Baer, D. M. Improvement of retardates' mealtime behaviors by timeout procedures using multiple baseline techniques. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1970, 3, 77-84.
- Bijou, S. W. Implications of behavioral science for counseling and guidance. In J. Krumboltz (Ed), *Revolution in counseling*, New York: Ronald, 1966, Chap. 2.
- Bushell, D. Jr., Wrobell, P. A., and Michaelis, M. L. Applying group contingencies to the classroom study behavior of preschool children. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1968, 1, 55-61.
- Ciavarella, M. A. Rogerian counseling theory: How practical for schools? *School Counselor*, 1972, 20, 109-114.
- Gumaer, J. and Myrick, R. D. Behavioral group counseling with disruptive children. *The School Counselor*, 1974, 21, 313-317.
- Hall, R. V., Lund, D., and Jackson, D. Effects of teacher attention on study behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1968, 1, 1-12.
- Hardiman, S. A., Goetz, E. M., Reuter, K. E., and LeBlanc, J. M. Primes, contingent attention, and training: effects on a child's motor behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1975, 8, 399-409.
- Hasazi, J. E. and Hasazi, S. E. Effects of teacher attention on digit-reversal behavior in an elementary school child. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1972, 5, 157-162.
- Holen, M. C. and Kinsey, W. M. Preferences for three theoretically derived counseling approaches. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1975, 22, 21-23.
- Kemp, C. G. *Intangibles in counseling*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.
- Krumboltz, J. Behavioral goals for counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1966, 13, 153-159.
- Lauver, P. J. Consulting with teachers: A systematic approach. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1974, 52, 535-540.
- Madsen, C. H. Jr., Becker, W. C., and Thomas, D. R. Rules, praise, and ignoring: elements of elementary classroom control. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1968, 1, 139-150.
- Madsen, C. H. Jr. and Madsen, C. K. *Teaching/discipline: behavioral principles toward a positive approach*. Expanded 2nd edition for professionals; Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1974.
- Madsen, C. H. Jr., Madsen, C. K., and Driggs, D. F. Freeing teachers to teach. In H. C. Rickard (Ed), *Behavioral intervention in human problems*, New York: Pergamon Press, Inc., 1971. Pp. 61-75.
- Mayer, G. R., Rohen, T. H., and Whitley, A. D. Group counseling with children: A cognitive-behavioral approach. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1969, 16, 142-149.
- McAllister, L. W., Stachowiak, J. G., Baer, D. M., and Conderman, L. The application of operant conditioning techniques in a secondary school classroom. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1969, 2, 277-285.
- McCullough, J. P. An investigation of the effects of model group size upon response facilitation in the high school classroom. *Behavior Therapy*, 1972, 3, 561-66.
- McLaughlin, T. F. The applicability of token reinforcement systems in public school systems. *Psychology in the Schools*, 1975, 12, 84-89.
- McLaughlin, T. F. and Malaby, J. E. Intrinsic reinforcers in a classroom token economy. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1972, 5, 263-270.
- McLaughlin, T. F. and Malaby, J. E. Partial component analysis of an inexpensive token system across two classrooms. *Psychological Reports*, 1975, 37, 362.
- McLaughlin, T. F. and Malaby, J. E. An analysis of assignment completion and accuracy across time under fixed, variable, and extended token exchange periods in a classroom token economy. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 1976, 1, 346-355.
- Meyer, J. B., Strowig, W., and Hosford, R. E. Behavioral reinforcement counseling with rural high school youth. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1970, 17, 127-132.
- O'Leary, K. D. and Becker, W. C. Behavior modification of an adjustment class: A token reinforcement program. *Exceptional Children*, 1967, 33, 637-642.
- O'Leary, K. D. and O'Leary, S. G. (Eds) *Classroom management*. New York: Pergamon Press, Inc., 1976.
- Palmo, A. J. and Kuzniar, J. Modification of behavior through group counseling and consultation. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, 1972, 6, 258-262.
- Raph, J. B., Goldberg, M. L., and Passow, A. H. *Bright underachievers*. New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1966.
- Rogers, C. R. *Client-centered therapy: Its current*

- practice, implications, and theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Thomas, D. R., Becker, W. C., and Armstrong, M. Production and elimination of disruptive classroom behavior by systematically varying teacher's behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1968, 1, 35-45.
- Wolf, M. M., Giles, D. K., and Hall, R. V. Experiments with token reinforcement in a remedial classroom. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 1968, 6, 51-64.

Received 13 August 1976.

(Final Acceptance 19 May 1977.)