Changing Behavior Through Simulation

An Alternate Design To T-Group Training

Alton C. Bartlett

As will clearly be seen from the following excerpts, taken from interviews with over 80 top management people, some express serious doubts or reservations about T-group training.[1]

> It's *group psychotherapy*. I don't want my decisionmakers to *have to* expose themselves to unstructured *attacks* on their psyches. Just can't believe it is right to *force* people to subject themselves to such a *possible psychological* threat, and, it is no damn good on a *voluntary* basis where some participate in laboratory training and some don't, especially since those who really need it don't go. *Leaderless, no content* training is a waste of time. Such train-

ing away from home is *too expensive* for us to afford, unless it can be *statistically proven* it does indeed have a highly *significant* impact on more *efficiency* in terms of *planning, decision making, reduced costs* and *higher profits*. No report yet, has satisfied me that what they supposedly learn away is ever *carried home* and *used effectively, over time!* (Italics stand for respondent inflection as heard on tape recorder)

It is important to note that they are not alone. Many "qualified" academicians have also raised questions on a variety of different points.

This article offers hope for the corporation which is uncomfortable ex-

Dr. Alton C. Bartlett

Associate Professor of Management, University of South Florida, Tampa.
Consultant in management development, organizational change, leadership
styles, and industrial and labor relations. Past President, Industrial Relations
Research Association for Western New York. Director, Essex Machine & Tool
Corporation. Associate, Research and Information Associates. Six and one-half
years, Assistant Professor at State University of New York at Buffalo's Industrial
Relations Department and extension teaching specialist, N.Y.S.S.I.L.R.,
Cornell University.

posing executives to what it perceives as a traumatic experience. It says, T-groups are not the *only* way to "make opportunity for expansion in depth" available. It describes an alternate (other than T-group) training design for improving individual manager's "interpersonal competence."[4] It reports success, in 300 to 500-employee organizations.[5] Individuals do come to *own* the conceptual tools of the behavioral sciences, and they do carry information and attitudes away from the laboratory, back to the work place. They also demonstrate improved performance on their job, and facilitate a significant increase in productivity and quality, a reduced absenteeism/turnover problem, plus cost reduction, which vastly improves the profit picture.[6]

Objectives and Assumptions

1. Fundamental to this design is the assumption that: *it is easier to change behavior than attitudes!* Why launch a direct onslaught upon the latter when they will follow if the former is changed?

2. Man may say (but he seldom believes) he doesn't "know it all."

3. Unless currently under extreme pressure from authority figures, man (drawing on his entire past experience) will recall favorable examples as proof that he does a fine job in dealing with and understanding people.

4. Man's attitudes concerning human behavior are deeply ingrained. He possesses an *"attitudinal" sound barrier* which must be penetrated before behavioral changes can occur. He must be "unfrozen," then changed.[7]

5. If someone engages you in theoretical discussions about human behavior, not grounded in your frame of reference, you may see them as interesting or even useful but, you certainly will be guilty of "selective exposure and awareness" plus "perceptual defense."[8]

6. The usual lectures and conferences which (at best) spoon feed neatly manageable bites of 'wisdom' are not nearly powerful enough to break through an "attitudinal" sound barrier.

7. Lasting changes as a result of conventional classroom methods are quite unlikely: their impact is temporary. Permanent changes call for utilizing unconventional methods.

8. One unconventional method for changing behavior, strong enough to pierce the "attitudinal" sound barrier, is *simulation*. This involves, under the guise of skill training, having subjects (Ss) practice *doing* differently (in a laboratory situation). As they are given rewards for *doing* differently, their attitudes will (absent pressure) tend to soften.

9. Next, their conventional behaviors will be experienced as inadequate, and they will start to change by the mechanism of "identification."[9]

10. By gradually changing the organization's structure and reward system to keep pace with the changes in behavior being simulated, behavior on the job will also change by "internalization."[10] As it changes, if favorable feedback and payoff continue to be received for change, their attitudes will also adapt. There will then be a "refreezing."[11]

The Training Design

The primary vehicle, intended to carry most of the burden down the long road to improved interpersonal competence, is a training program ostensibly to improve communications. There are several reasons.

To begin with, improvement in interpersonal competence is partially dependent upon a free flowing dialogue between all principals. It is important, therefore, to focus everyone's attention upon fundamentals of communication like to whom, why, where, when, what, and how. While informal skills ought to be upgraded early, formal skills must be.

Secondly, communication is a neutral subject in the sense that it is devoid of "content."[12] The focus is entirely on "process."[13] Though this design also calls for introducing a number of conceptual tools, it is important that none of them are specifically related to the company's policies and procedures. Usage of material of this nature allows the change agent (CA) to be an expert in *how*, not, a judge of *what*. This is conducive to the rapid creation of a climate of trust between CA and Ss. Said climate could be vital, for example, if there were expectations of much frustration, uncertainty, or bitterness among participants. It could facilitate their unloading problems and achieving catharsis.

A third reason is that since the purpose is to increase everyone's capacity to work effectively with others, a practical and painless method, in what will be seen as a natural site, has to be devised. *Simulation* in an in-house laboratory is herein proposed to satisfy both of these and at the same time: (a) accomplish goals similar to those of a T-group, while; (b) recognizing and being responsive to objections similar to the ones above. Consider the reasoning behind this proposal.

A Practical and Painless Method

Skill training in communications, where Ss would continually get to practice "listening and telling,"[14] will lend itself naturally to broadening their frame of reference and perceptions related to human behavior. Interpersonal competence will be developing as a by-product of *doing* differently: (a) while practicing new behaviors they will be receiving descriptive nonevaluative feedback as to how well they are doing; (b) rewards will flow for more empathic, creative, open behavior from both CA and peers, and; (c) the intimidating specter of failure, as new risk taking actions are tried, is not present because the emphasis is on learning a skill, not the ancillary behaviors.

A Natural Site

Now there are clearly some distinct advantages to employing the concept of the "cultural island" in terms of being away from the daily grind

> . . . in order to train adults in new patterns of interpersonal behavior it is desirable to *remove* them from their *standard* environments and place them in *special* environments where they are free to innovate, practice, and test new behaviors. (my italics)[15]

There are disadvantages too. Often a firm cannot spare whole days, let alone weeks, from any number of their supervisor's work time. Perhaps they cannot justify the cost of travel, rooms, meals, plus salaries. To the heads of many small, highly-competitive firms, these are legitimate obstacles.[16] Even more important, from a broad viewpoint, one certainly cannot even try to carry newly-learned behaviors back to the job while away from it. Ultimately, however, comes the question as to how one (or a dozen for that matter) manager, returning with even evangelical fervor from two weeks exposure to a T-group, can be expected to have very much lasting impact on organizational climate? If he tells others what he experienced (and most cannot articulate this well) peers are unlikely to understand, and suppose they did, could this cause them to

demonstrate a new pattern of behavior? If he engages in the same open, risk taking behavior back home, as the T-group climate may elicit, many will view him as "some kind of a nut"! If he encourages others to join him, he (and in many cases they) may lose his job for starting an insurrection.[17]

To counteract such disadvantages, what could be a more obvious and natural laboratory for changing behavior than a classroom where communications skills are being worked on? When you are simulating new behaviors every day in class, and then going back to work, it is easy and normal to try them out while they are fresh in your mind. Where reactions are favorable to new methods, and this program improves the kind of behavior that will make them so, there is an immediate reward which cannot help but enhance the transference of new patterns of behavior from classroom simulation to the real world of the job.

To summarize the third reason, the training design attempts to set up a modified form of cultural island within the plant. Programs are

> . . . conducted in locations which are psychologically if not geographically remote from everyday life.[18]

To illustrate, one conference room can be turned over completely to the program, making absolutely certain by words and deeds that this is their private sanctuary: a place apart. To assist in this, make sure regular company business is *not* conducted there during this time, never let any supervisor be taken away from the laboratory to attend to matters of business (the point is that this program is of equal importance), and; make sure whatever goes on in the room is *not* carried away and reported to superiors.[19]

Remember, an attempt is being made to introduce change from the top down, through all levels of management *at once*. To accomplish this, continuing classes using simulated behavior are run, which will be taken in turn each day by each different level of supervision. Certainly this will affect: (a) their interactions, sentiments, norms, activities, and symbols[20]; (b) the formal, informal, and nonformal social structure, [21] and; (c) the existing technology[22] in the work place each successive day. It is meant to! Unless you close the plant down, such an all encompassing change has to be undertaken in the work place during regular operations.

Finally, a last reason for electing communications training is that it seemed desirable to provide the means by which Ss may develop their own new guidelines to fit their own new behavior. Where do they want the formal channels of communication to be? Conference leadership training, as a sub-part of communication, is a practical way for this and other guidelines to be studied, discussed, and established while they are purportedly mastering the skills of the "good" conference leader. This is also how they get considerable practice thinking and acting within the framework of decision making, but with no threat of punishment for failure. It develops more confidence, certainty, attention to process, and responsibility for when they are back in the day-to-day life of the real organization. Let a loser feel free to try to win and he gets confident.

Case Method Techniques

The two major techniques selected to best provide simulation are the case method and role playing. Of course, these would be supplemented, as appropriate, by other techniques such as specially created "spot lectures" of

150 to 400 words, the Pigor *incident process*,[23] and other meaningful exercises on occasion to portray an essential fact or clue.[24]

A series of case problems and incidents can be developed which consist of factual, uninterpreted accounts of problems which have taken place within the organization. Earliest ones can include a description of what happened (what people did, said, and thought), real in every detail but, of course, disguised to render identification impossible.[25] Later cases should get increasingly vague and sketchy so that Ss will have to project much of their own frame of reference into them. The CA usually discovers a considerable number of Ss who are unable to define company policy while in this phase. Frequently, during a discussion of a case, Ss can be asked to act out what they are saying. The other roles required can best be acted out by the CA as he knows best how to structure the situation to get the desired result. Here is where Ss get the first glimmer of their interpersonal deficiencies in not being "socially sensitive and behaviorally flexible."[26] Note they experience it; they are not told or scolded.

Role Playing Techniques

Interaction situations, adapted in advance from real ones that took place in this company, and which are *loaded* with emotional elements, can be introduced. The two basic roles are *interviewer* (*Ier*) and *interviewee* (*Iee*). The former is the important role. *Ier* should get minimal coaching and little time to prepare. Set the scene with him out of the room! The latter role requires a stooge, "programmed" to give the appropriate response (reward), only if the *Ier* shows facile interpersonal competence. Whenever the *Ier* deviates, the *Iee* does not give him any reward, in fact, he lies, crys, talks incessantly, yells, clams up, or usurps role of *Ier.* In other words, part of the learning comes from peers observing *Iers*, but this cannot happen unless the *Iee* is carefully coached. Experience seems to suggest that the *Iee* should: (a) be given his fact sheet several days in advance, at which time the mood should be established, so he will have time to study and think his part through; (b) be carefully coached again in front of the whole class before bringing the *Ier* in and setting him up.

It is extremely important that these role play situations are never allowed to be seen as a win/lose encounter. The point must be repeatedly stressed in giving pre role play instructions that these are only being done to provide a basis for discussion and it is to be expected that the *Ier* will have a tough time: the deck is stacked against him on purpose, and everyone must be allowed to see this as the coaching is done in front of them. Consider excerpts from consensus of S's after training: "since we believe no one's job, or income, is hanging on the outcome, since we learn our boss will not find out, and since we perceive it as a situation which appears far removed from our own job and company, we view this as a *safe environment.*"

In sum, opportunities for growth are provided Ss as: (a) *interviewers*, where they have an opportunity in this safe environment to test a variety of approaches to real situations encountered every day in their jobs; (b) *interviewees*, where they have a chance to experience such broad differences between autocratic, demanding, unsure, emphatic, risk taking, creative, open, and other types of bosses, and; (c) *observers*, where they have a chance to watch and analyze actual interactions between two people in a work oriented situation, and to speculate what they would do if it were

their turn "on camera."

Two Tape Recorders

One tape recorder is used only during role playing, discussions of cases, or mock conferences. It provides for instant playback that allows diagnosis, analysis, and prescription of alternative courses of action while it is still fresh in Ss minds. The second runs continuously each session so everything is captured for later review. It is very important to re-record[27] tapes in such a way as to render all voices unrecognizable though understandable. Ss are then free to borrow them to play again so as to heighten learning through recall. This can be more conducive to learning than some of real life. For the most part a real encounter is over before one has time to gather his wits about him. There is no way to bring the episode back to see it as it really happened. Either one is left to walk away muttering when he said you're fired, I should have said you can't fire me, I quit, or, as it becomes ancient history most of us embellish our performance until at long last we distinctly remember how we put him in his place so he'll never forget it.

The advantage offered by simulation exercises is that anyone may bring up any number of ideas that might have worked, and they can be acted out and replayed on the spot, and later, for comparison with former tactics. Now all this amounts to is trial and error, but this is known to be a most effective way for learning complex behavioral skills and what effects they have on others.

Preserving Anonymity

To assure Ss that their behavior will not become known to their superiors, fish, bird, and animal names can be affixed to name tags and distributed to each S at the opening session. Between using names no way connectable to the S, and re-recording tapes so no one connected with the firm ever hears the originals, Ss believe they are protected. The CA also establishes from the outset, however, that he owns the tapes, and in addition, demonstrates how a re-recorded tape sounds.

Implementation: Stage One— Perception

The initial step, after warmup, is to cause each S to recognize that what he sees is not simply "what is," but is rather, a product of what is in his brain acting upon a picture received from his eyes. In short, the mind sees; the eyes only send information to the brain for interpretation. Each one's brain, in turn, is conditioned by all of one's socio-politico-psychological-economic environment and experience.

To insure that this message breaks through their attitudinal sound barrier, several different illusory devices can be introduced.[28] The CA has used a stencil cutout of the letters SLY in capitals on a full sheet of white paper, in white. Managerial Ss have been 96% (289/300) unable to "see" the letters because they said, "they assumed that they were looking at dark letters on a light background," which (based upon a lifetime of experience) they expected.[29] When told the background is dark, the letters light, their eyes refocus and they report "seeing it" at once. Another strong eye opener is Leavitt's picture of the two women.[30] These, and a myriad of others, all serve another purpose (tension relaxer) too.

While the majority will claim they "see it" right away, someone always admits he doesn't make anything out. This triggers hurried glances and furtive whispers. Then Ss begin to buzz and openly show each other what they see. Many, who claimed at first to "see it" can clearly be heard on the

tape, later, saying such things as:

> Oh! Now I see it. Well I'll be. Ha
> Ha! Clever? Hmmm! Ha! Ho! Huh!
> Isn't that the darndest thing? My God
> I felt my eyeballs snap when you
> pointed it out for me. I really couldn't
> see it. I don't see it yet! Show me.

Experience has shown the impact of this is tremendous, and it should not be necessary to note the purpose is not to entertain, but to get a conceptual understanding of perception. It may be unorthodox, but it works. The first session starts with this because the balance of the material draws upon it, and only because it leads off is there such a strong overtone of hokum.

Frame of Reference

This concept is presented in the form of a paper and pencil exercise. It grows quite naturally out of perception. Ss are given two tasks: (a) make a 6 from IX by adding only one more line; (b) using no more than four lines, connect three rows of three dots. Despite the care that is taken *not* to convey a frame of reference, Ss indicate later they felt as if they *had to* stick with what they perceived as a given frame of reference. They say, IX, like a Roman Numeral, seems to call for a straight line; the nine dots appear as a square, and suggest no line should be drawn outside of it. Since the IX can *only* be made into a 6 by adding a crooked line (SIX), and you must go outside of the dots to connect them, only slightly over four per cent ever accomplish the task.[31]

To repeat, the purpose of such exercises *is to send a concrete message about perception and frame of reference* which can be reintroduced whenever appropriate. The CA needs only make a comment such as:

> Remember, some people just cannot
> see that old woman . . . you are

searching within those nine dots for a solution again, or, trying to get (SIX) the hard way? . . .

and the S will smile or chuckle as he recalls how he handled the exercise or (as sometimes happens) how he didn't "see" SLY for over two weeks. Of prime importance, though, he will remember the message about perception.

> What a set of words, or a particular
> action, means to you or me depends
> upon our "frame of reference." That
> is, if my way of thinking or looking at
> things is different from yours, I will
> get a different meaning from the same
> communication . . . To develop a
> *common understanding*, it would be
> *necessary* for at least *one* of this pair
> to *learn the other's* . . . way of look-
> ing at things.[32] (my italics)

Time can be spent having Ss practice on three or four line "caselets"[33] where they can learn either to: (a) get into the other fellow's frame of reference; (b) get him to join theirs, or; (c) both move to some neutral ground. At this stage the first one is definitely encouraged.

The Plurality of Self

A matrix may be drawn for the alternates of our "self."[34] This one introduces Ss to at least four possibilities. Self A is known to me and everyone else (I wear glasses). Self B is known to me but not to others (I abhor both art and opera, but pretend to care when a colleague treats me by letting me see or hear his favorites). Self C is unknown to me yet everyone coming in close face-to-face contact with me knows and conceals from me that (I have bad breath). Self D is unknown to me and all others too. (How many times have we said, I was shocked or I had no idea X was like that? Well, remember, X had no idea he was like that either, be-

Table I

Four Alternates of "Self"

	Known to Others	Unknown to Others
Known to Me	Self A	Self B
Unknown to Me	Self C	Self D

cause had he only realized it, he could have sought help).

Since the focus of this change program will be on Self B and C, some technique has to be devised to cause each S to examine his own carefully, without being allowed to become unduly frightened at such an early stage. One technique the CA often uses involves the introduction (via a story) of a friend who really exists. He can become a sort of surrogate: effective for introducing ideas.[35]

The story notes this friend always has the Ss he trains "write out one or two things about their Self B on a piece of paper, anonymously, and give it to him." At this point, instead of telling what the friend learns, CA writes the results on a sheet of paper which he folds, and gives to a high status S to hold. "To better demonstrate," CA then asks each S to do what the friend's Ss do. Papers are gathered and read aloud without comment. The S, holding what the CA had written, is now asked to read it aloud. The CA wrote, "over 60% usually indicate in one way or another that they have a feeling of insecurity or inadequacy."[36]

The point almost makes itself: most managerial groups, no matter how high the level, will respond in a similar manner. CA can now ask Ss to "look around the room at your peers."

Do you realize that over two out of three of your peers in this room *feel* this way, and *admit* it? Perhaps more secretly feel this way! This is true all the way up in your firm. Imagine the improved atmosphere if you all started leveling with each other when you are unsure, instead of bluffing, blustering, and trying to conceal your uncertainty.

In this spot lecture, CA can also restate the prime objectives are to: (a) give each one the opportunity to openly admit we do not always have answers; (b) provide the time and a place to seek to find answers; (c) experiment with being open, giving and getting descriptive nonevaluative feedback, taking risks, and; (d) to do this with confidence because there is no longer a need to be afraid of being punished, ridiculed, or found out for doing so. The CA always has talked openly of his uncertain self at this moment, too.

Illustrating the Importance of Feedback

Have Ss select one S who is good with technical material (engineer) to help in a demonstration. Seated at the front of the room, with his back to the group, and given a sheet with a number of like geometric objects arranged in a specific spatial way,[37] S is asked to describe (with no verbal or visual clues from other Ss) what he sees while they try to create an exact replica. The results are anything but a duplication of what he sees. This is repeated with a second S who is allowed to face Ss and receive yes or no responses, only, from them. These copies will be better. Finally, a third

S repeats this but he is allowed complete freedom, visually and verbally, to interact. Now practically all Ss are able to draw a facsimile of the original. Important points about feedback can be stressed.

Communication often is *much* faster if feedback is eliminated, but it is *much* more effective in obtaining superior performance, even if *much* slower, when feedback is allowed.

Improving Communication: Stage Two

Far more is meant by improving communication than just writing clear memos. Managers must master oral communication. They need to know, in addition to how to communicate, what, where, when, why, and to whom!

When to Communicate and Why

The transition can be smooth. What happens as a result of poor, or no, exchanges of verbal and visual information has already been demonstrated. The use of a before and after type of approach (similar to the two-part "Case of the Extra Half Plum"), in which Ss hear carefully staged pre-recordings of what is *bad*, then *good*, nondirective interviewing technique, paves the way for discussing the whole matter of communication.

How to Communicate

The natural breaks between class sessions must be utilized to assign outside readings. By the time they reach this point, Ss need to feel at home with several concepts including: "active listening,"[39] "empathy,"[40] "defensive communication,"[41] "masterminding,"[42] "premature judgment,"[43] and "probe,"[44] to name but a few.[45] Since they do read about them out of class, too, considerable time can be spent in class to allow them to *own* these concepts. Exercises, spot lectures, case problems, role playing,

and reports of findings from additional research will all assist in this undertaking, and much can be accomplished with anecdotal material also.

To Whom to Communicate, What, and Where

A never ending source of amazement is how much less common agreement is found among supervision as to where they are supposed to go to provide information, what to tell, and to whom to tell it, than textbooks, based on the idea of a rational man, would have us believe. Most Ss really do believe they know, until they are confronted with specific situations. A recent change program uncovered a company's Table of Organization (report to, structure) set up in such a manner that when certain types of communication were issued through the normal distribution system, seven second level supervisors, with 30% of the work force reporting to them, would not hear of the order and thus could not pass it on.

It is vitally necessary, therefore, to allow Ss time to work out and understand the formal channels of communication: what do they say, and where do they say it, to tell whom: (a) there is a shortage of a scarce material? (b) you are unable to meet specifications? (c) of an easier way to do something? (d) about an employee with halitosis? (e) of a personal problem adversely affecting your work? (f) that hot order the president said must go out today isn't going? Role playing is invaluable for this, and so is the mock conference designed to allow practice in conducting an effective conference. Ss actually decide the answers while using these problems only to practice learning how to decide.

A Final Word About Role Playing

Despite the protestations of many

that role playing is little more than a game, or, just isn't real life, the evidence (this CA finds) is quite the opposite.[46] Granted there is a brief moment of self-consciousness when Ss show off or laugh nervously. Some even try a finesse, asking much like the method actor might, about the motivation of the part.

Handle this, however, and they will throw themselves into their part so completely that they lose their inhibitions and assume their real life identity. That is, as they begin to dig in, they get anxious to show how well they can do, and they pull out all the stops. This means they handle interviewees in the normal manner including browbeating, pleading, yelling, or passing the buck. Whether 1,9; 1,1; 5,5; 9,1; or 9,9 managers, this is where they will drop the facade and show their true colors.[47]

A vice president, while playing the role of a production foreman, was trying to get an employee (actually his own boss) to work overtime on Saturday. The employee, coached not to agree for Saturday, but to jump at Friday night or Sunday, provided the interviewer (using the proper tools supposedly learned) listened, showed he understood, and offered the alternatives himself. Interviewee was not to volunteer, hint, or make it easy. After one of the worst exhibitions of authoritarian pressure possible, including masterminding, arguing, and thinly veiled threats, with no attention to the employee or any alternate solution, the VP lost control. He became red-faced, began screaming and pounding on the table, and finally fired the employee in a tirade

> I'm not mad. I never get mad (louder). You wait, I'll fix it so you never get another day's work, damn it! I tried to be fair about this, see both sides, can't you see my point of view? We

both have a job to do. I'm doing mine, you have to do yours tomorrow. That's an order! You say you won't? Alright, you're fired!

Conclusion

This has been a description in some detail of a program the CA has used on a number of occasions. It will help improve the interpersonal competence of a corporation's managers. The design is intended specifically to do this while also being attentive to certain reservations expressed in some quarters about the t-group approach. It must be noted:
1. It will not help unless properly introduced from the top down,

through all levels at once, with a simultaneous, but gradual, change in both pay-off structure and organizational climate.
2. It will not help everyone. Some will feel threatened. Some will consider quitting.
3. It should not be used until, and unless, top management is ready to accept open, risk taking, creative, emphatic behavior on the part of subordinates and to act in a similar manner toward them.

Assuming these essentials are understood, and acceptable, however, this program will do the job. Behavior can, and has, been changed by the technique called *simulation*.[48]

References

1. This does not mean that I agree with their perceptions. The fact is that is immaterial. It does not matter what is correct. Correct is what they believe it to be! I am being responsive to their reality.

2. Cf., George Odiorne. "The Trouble with Sensitivity Training," *Training Directors Journal*, Oct. 1963; John E. Drotning, "Sensitivity Training: Some Critical Questions," *Personnel Journal*, Vol. 45, No. 10, Nov., 1966; pp. 604-606; *Business Week*, "Where Executives Tear Off The Masks," Sep. 3, 1966, pp. 76-83; Wendell W. Wolfe, "Human Relations Laboratory Training: Three Questions," *Journal of Business*, Oct., 1966, pp. 512-515; John E. Drotning, "Sensitivity Training in Business Organizations: Some Limitations," (in press).

3. See Alexander Winn. "Social Change in Industry: From Insight to Implementation," *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 2, No. 2, Apr.-June, 1966, p. 174 and passim.

4. The definition of this term is that of Chris Argyris, "Explorations in Interpersonal Competence—I," *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan.-Mar., 1965, p. 59.

5. It should be noted that William P. Gellerman, Assistant Professor, N.Y.S.S.I.L.R., Cornell University, New York City Extension, has used portions of a similar design in a much larger organization with apparent good results.

6. For a detailed exposition see, Alton C. Bartlett, "Changing Behavior as a Means to Increased Efficiency," *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, (in press, 1967).

7. Kurt Lewin. "Frontiers in Group Dynamics: Concept, Method, and Reality in Social Science," *Human Relations*, Vol. 1, 1947, pp. 5-42.

8. For definition see, Bernard Berelson and Gary L. Steiner, *Human Behavior*, Harcourt, Brace, World, 1964, pp. 100-102.

9. Edgar H. Schein. "Management Development as a Process of Influence," *Industrial Management Review*, Vol. 2, No. 2, May, 1961, p. 62.

10. Ibid.

11. Kurt Lewin, op. cit.

12. George Strauss and Leonard Sayles, "Personnel," Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960, p. 242.

13. Ibid.

14. Alexander Winn. "Training in Administration and Human Relations," *Personnel,* Vol. 30, Sep., 1953, pp. 139-149.

15. Ronald Lippitt, Jeanne Watson, and Bruce Westley. "The Dynamics of Planned Change," Harcourt, Brace, World, 1958, p. 111.

16. This is not an academic theory. Over 50 heads of small firms have agreed to intensive in-depth interviews, lasting from one to two hours, concerning these and other considerations about training.

17. This entire analysis represents a synthesis of the reflection from former T-group Ss who have experienced precisely these kinds of end results and problems when they returned home from a cultural island.

18. Douglas McGregor. "The Human Side of Enterprise," McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960, p. 223.

19. Naturally, CA can, and will, report aggregate behavior, sentiments, and norms. No individual, however, should be identified or singled out by name as having said or done any particular thing.

20. These concepts are used in the sense that William F. Whyte, "Money and Motivation," Harper & Brothers, 1955, pp. 191-193, uses them.

21. Robert Dubin. "The World of Work," Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

22. By technology is meant the whole gamut covered in Leonard R. Sayles, "Behavior of Industrial Work Groups," Wiley, 1958.

23. Paul Pigors and Faith Pigors. "The Incident Process: Case Studies in Management, Series I. Supervisory Problems," Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Washington, D. C., 1955, and; "Cases in Human Relations: The Incident Process," McGraw-Hill, 1961.

24. Cf., Harold J. Leavitt. "Managerial Psychology," 2nd ed., The University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 141-145.

25. Set this company's real interaction situations in government, hospital, restaurant, university, or any other organization, with the different argot, job titles, and structures. Situations will thus be familiar to Ss, but not identifiable, and they will be real.

26. Robert Tannenbaum. "Dealing with Ourselves before Dealing with Others," *Office Executive,* Vol. 32, No. 8, Aug., 1957, pp. 29-30.

27. This involves transferring the recorded material from one recorder to dictating equipment at a "slightly different speed," and then, at another speed, transferring it onto yet another tape recorder.

28. Cf., Berelson & Steiner, op. cit., pp. 87-131; R. L. Gregory, "Eye and Brain," London: World University Library, 1966; S. Tolansky, "Optical Illusions," London: Pergamon Press, 1966.

29. No significant difference is found with 877 graduate and undergraduate students who have been confronted with this.

30. Harold J. Leavitt, op. cit., p. 29.

31. Of over 500 management Ss given this exercise, 455 have tried to stay within the (perceived) box, and 435 have tried to stick with a straight line. Of these, 325 and 313 respectively, expressed some feeling that I had cheated when I went outside the box and wrote SIX.

32. Adapted from Lester Tarnopol. "Attitudes Block Communications," *Personnel Journal,* Vol. 37, No. 9, Feb., 1959, pp. 325-328.

33. Cf., Strauss and Sayles, op. cit., pp. 234-235, for examples.

34. This model utilizes the concept of the *Jo-Hari Window* attributable to Joseph Luft (Jo) and Harrington Ingham (Hari). See ""Healthy Interactions a Composite Clinical Picture," *Journal of General Psychology,* Vol. 57, 1957, pp. 241-246, also; *Journal of Social Psychology,* Vol. 39, 1954, pp. 293-297.

35. Note, for best results, keep their attention on the friend and his technique, like you are letting them in on something confidential.

36. CA has utilized this approach with 178 Ss in management training and development, or change, programs for presidents, functional staff experts, top line managers, and foremen of well-known, and obscure, profitable, and unprofitable, firms. Over two out of every three Ss have voiced similar feeling no matter which level they represent! Ronald Lippitt, "The Collusion of Ignorance," *Trans-action*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Jan., 1964, offers a fine discussion which suggests that people do not realize how others feel and are afraid or ashamed to admit how they feel. This is exactly what this CA has found.

37. Harold J. Leavitt, op. cit., pp. 141-145.

38. Cited in Strauss and Sayles, op. cit., pp. 235-237 and attendant answer book.

39. Carl B. Rogers and Richard E. Farson, "Active Listening," in Bergen and Haney (eds.), "Organizational Relations and Management Action," McGraw-Hill, 1966, pp. 61-76.

40. Robert N. McMurry. "Empathy: Management's Greatest Need," *Advanced Management*, Vol. 18, No. 7, July, 1953, pp. 6-11, 34.

41. Jack R. Gibb. "Defensive Communication," *Journal of Communication*, Vol. XI, No. 3, Sep., 1961, pp. 141-148.

42. Strauss and Sayles, op. cit., p. 233.

43. Ibid., p. 232.

44. Robert L. Kahn and Charles F. Cannell. "The Dynamics of Interviewing," Wiley, 1957, pp. 203-232.

45. Other readings include, Carl Rogers and F. J. Roethlisberger, "Barriers and Gateways to Communication," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 30, No. 4, July, 1952, pp. 46-52; Robert Tannenbaum, op. cit., pp. 29-30; Solomon E. Asch, "Opinions and Social Pressure, *Scientific American*, Nov., 1955, pp. 31-34, and; Richard S. Crutchfield, "Conformity and Character," *American Psychologist*, Vol. X, 1955, pp. 191-198.

46. As Herbert C. Kelman, "Deception in Social Research," *Trans-action*, Vol. 3, No. 5, Jul.-Aug., 1966, p. 24, says: "In general the results of role-playing experiments have been very encouraging."

47. These managerial styles are full developed in R. R. Blake and J. S. Mouton, "The Managerial Grid," Gulf Publishing Co., 1964, especially pp. 18-211.

48. Alton C. Bartlett, op. cit.

Famous Schools Plans Acquisition of Evelyn Wood Reading Institute

Famous Artists Schools, Inc., has announced plans to acquire the Evelyn Wood Reading Dynamics Institute, it was declared jointly by Gilbert K. Granet, President of Famous Artists Schools and George C. Webster, President of Diversified Education and Research Corp., of Washington, D. C., parent of Evelyn Wood Reading Dynamics Institute.

Famous Artists Schools, with its subsidiaries, Famous Schools International, International Accountants Society and Linguaphone Institute, currently teaches home study courses in art, writing, photography, accounting subjects and language to over a quarter million students in this country and abroad.