

Ralph H. Kilmann

The Effect of Interpersonal Values on Laboratory Training: An Empirical Investigation

ABSTRACT

The present study investigated the effect of participant and trainer Interpersonal Value Constructs (IVC's) on the behavior and experiences that took place in eight sensitivity training groups. IVC's were defined as: mental categories through which an individual perceives and interprets the desirable and undesirable features of interpersonal behavior. The assessment of IVC's was by a scaled projective technique: the Kilmann Insight Test (KIT). Results suggest that interpersonal values as communicated by mostly nonconscious expressions do influence behavior in a T-group. In particular, depending on the match between trainer and participant IVC's (similarities and/or dissimilarities) the participant is more likely to have 'positive' interpersonal experiences in his group. Also, independent of the trainer, the specific IVC's that a participant applies in his group affects other participants becoming attracted to him and developing respect towards him.

The notion of values and ethical issues has become an increasing concern of social scientists involved in affecting and changing individuals and organizations (e.g. Bennis, Benne, and Chin, 1968; Argyris, 1970). As Tannenbaum and Davis (1970) observe, 'Perhaps the most persuasive common characteristic among people in laboratory training and in organizational development work is their values, and yet, while organizational development academicians and practitioners are generally aware of their shared values and while these values implicitly guide much of what they do, they too have usually been reluctant to make them explicit'. To this I add, not only are the values of applied social scientists left implicit, it is not at all clear *what* effect their values actually have on some client system, nor *how* this effect takes place. In order to better appreciate and understand the role of values in laboratory situations, the present study sought to utilize a concept of values that is expected to be especially relevant to this area of investigation.

TOWARD A UNIQUE CONCEPT OF VALUES

The concept of values has been utilized in every discipline within the social sciences with a great variety of meanings. For example, values have been defined as interests, pleasures, likes, preferences, duties, moral obligations, desires, wants, needs, aversions, attractions, and many other types of 'selective orientation' (Pepper, 1958). What seems of primary importance for the development of behavioral science, however, is that the concept of values be differentiated from other 'neighboring' concepts in a given disciplinary or interdisciplinary study.

In order to define values uniquely, it seems that 'values' might be defined vis á vis a set of *evaluative* dimensions. Some evaluative dimensions are: good-bad, right-wrong, desirable-undesirable, appropriate-inappropriate, shoulds, and oughts. In reference to the many social science concepts, this perspective suggests the many ways in which values as evaluative dimensions can be present in human behavior. For example, values can be guides to what needs, wants, desires people *should* have, what interests, preferences, and goals are seen as *desirable* or *undesirable*, what individual dispositions or traits one *ought* to have, and what beliefs and attitudes individuals *should* express.

The foregoing approach to values not only affords the possibility of an interdisciplinary integration of values, but allows the concept of values to be readily distinguishable from other social science concepts.

A FOCUS ON INTERPERSONAL VALUES

Because the present study is concerned with laboratory training (and the implications for organizational development), it is worthwhile to consider what value focus might be most useful for this area of investigation. In particular, what type of shoulds and oughts would be expected to affect significant aspects of laboratory behavior?

It appears to me that values which would affect laboratory *behavior* in a significant manner, are values that specify how one ought to *behave* in *interpersonal situations*. This follows from the laboratory emphasis on interpersonal phenomena as a way to learn about groups, individuals, and one's self (Bradford *et al.*, 1964; Golembiewski and Blumberg, 1970). In addition, organizational development specialists have also emphasized the type and quality of interpersonal behavior as an indication of organizational health (e.g. Argyris, 1970; Bennis, 1966). This type of value focus is in contrast to other possible types of values.

For example, I am excluding values that suggest what motives individuals should have when they interact with other individuals. Also, I am not including values that indicate what interests or attitudes are appropriate for interpersonal encounters. The concept which the 'values of behavior' emphasize is probably best viewed as the individual traits, dispositions, or tendencies that are appropriate to interpersonal situations.

Rokeach (1969) distinguishes between instrumental values and terminal values. The former are defined as specific modes of conduct that are personally or socially desirable to alternative modes of conduct. The latter are analogously defined via end-states of existence (i.e. long range goals). Rokeach's notion of instrumental values is quite similar to a focus on what behavior is desirable for an individual. *Instrumental values* will thus be taken as a referent for a concept of values specific to interpersonal behavior. This is consistent with the 'values of behavior' relating to individual traits, dispositions, and tendencies; the concepts by which modes of behavior are typically described.

VALUE INSTRUMENTS

Of the several instruments that propose to measure some concept of values in the social sciences, the majority have value items that are exceedingly vague and general, and whose relevancy to interpersonal behavior is not immediately apparent (see Kilmann, 1972, for a review). In fact, most of the value instruments seem to be assessing terminal as opposed to instrumental values, the former being much less tied to concrete behavior (e.g. Allport *et al.*, 1951; Morris, 1956; Gorlow and Noll, 1967). Furthermore, many of the value instruments do not explicate a definition of values. Instead, values are confused with descriptive personality traits, interests, needs and pleasures in life.

Because of the present study's focus on instrumental values it was decided to use the Kilmann Insight Test (KIT) in the empirical investigation of values and laboratory training (Kilmann, 1972). This instrument is a projective test which requires an individual to differentiate on a seven point scale, 18 'concerns' according to how relevant they are to a series of six ambiguous pictures of interpersonal behavior. These 'concerns' are actually a list of instrumental values modified from the list suggested by Rokeach (1969). In particular, the concept of values that is purported to be measured is titled '*interpersonal value construct*' (IVC) and is defined as: a mental category through which an individual perceives and interprets the desirable and undesirable features of interpersonal behavior.

The basic assumption of the KIT is that the more a particular interpersonal value is significant to an individual (i.e. the more the individual believes that one should behave or act in a certain manner in an interpersonal situation), the more the individual's cognitive processes will be organized to construe interpersonal phenomena via a set of constructs reflective of that value. This value concept is expected to be most relevant in complex and ambiguous interpersonal situations which are subject to different perceptions and interpretations.

The 18 interpersonal value constructs from the KIT have been factor analyzed into two relatively independent factor indices ($r = -0.12$), which had reasonably high internal consistency (average alpha = 0.75) (Kilmann, 1972).

Factor 1 was labeled 'Good Fellowship versus Functional Task Activity', and *Factor 2* was titled 'Interpersonal Restraint versus Boldness'. The bipolar labels reflect the positive and negative loadings that occurred on each factor. *Exhibit 1* summarizes the value factors from the KIT.

In essence, *Factor 1* seems to represent *what* values one should focus on (i.e. the content of the values). Specifically, *Factor 1* represents the relative extent that an individual believes that one should act in a Good Fellowship versus a Functional Task Activity type manner. The specifics of these 'shoulds' would be the items that compose each pole of the factor. Independent from *Factor 1*, *Factor 2* represents an individual's values of *how* one should act with respect to some value focus or content. Should one be bold or restrained with respect to some interpersonal situation. Perhaps *Factor 2* represents contrasting 'shoulds' about the *process* of behavior as distinct from the focus of behavior (*Factor 1*). However, since the assessment by the KIT is projective, *an individual is expected to express these interpersonal values in a more or less unconscious manner as he interacts with other individuals* (e.g. unconscious verbal or nonverbal expressions). While more research needs to be done with the KIT to elaborate and further test these interpretations, these statements present the current construct validity of the instrument (for the complete validity study see, Kilmann, 1972).

Exhibit 1: Factor labels and items from the Kilmann Insight Test (KIT).

Factor 1: Good Fellowship versus Functional Task Activity.

- + forgivingness
- + affection
- + cheerfulness
- + helpfulness
- + broadmindedness
- logic
- intellect
- capability
- orderliness
- responsibility

Factor 2: Interpersonal Restraint versus Boldness.

- + politeness
- + self-control
- + obedience
- courage
- imagination
- honesty
- independence

VALUES AND THE T-GROUP

In order to empirically investigate the relationship between values and laboratory training, it is necessary to consider the specific context of

'T-group life' and in what manner individual values are likely to operate. While the literature has not addressed the concept of values as the present study is defining it, the term has been used in general descriptions of T-group phenomena.

Bennis (1962) defined what he termed the goals and meta-goals of laboratory training. Beyond the basic laboratory goals as Bennis suggests, 'there rests another set of learnings which shall be referred to as "meta-goals" (or values if you would prefer)'. Bennis further indicates that these values affect all aspects of T-group behavior, ranging from the design of the lab to actual trainer interventions in the group. The four meta-goals (or values) that Bennis describes are as follows: (1) expanded consciousness and recognition of choice, (2) a spirit of inquiry, (3) authenticity in interpersonal relationships, and (4) a collaborative conception of the authority relationship. These values are consistent with the ones suggested by Tannenbaum and Davis (1970).

Bennis' notion of meta-goals can be viewed as those underlying dimensions of behavior which individuals are expected to learn or *should* learn in a T-group. While the actual meta-goals as stated are fairly general, a little imagination can suggest how they relate to the two factors of the KIT. In any event, a 'meta-goal' might be manifested as an interpersonal value construct that is applied, emphasized or explored in a T-group setting.

Benne *et al.* (1964) present a specific set of learnings which are important to participants of T-groups. One such learning involves the staff's (trainer's) 'attempts to stimulate the clarification and development of personal values and goals consonant with a democratic and scientific approach to problems of social and personal decision and action'. In other words, the interventions the trainers make in the T-group may include the expression of values that the participants are expected to experience and/or internalize. In addition, Benne *et al.* (1964) observe that, 'In the associational life of the laboratory the participant is challenged to reassess the adequacy of his value orientations. The participant ordinarily needs support in focusing reconstructive attention upon discrepancies among differing values he lives by in various parts of his life or between his interpersonal values and the values implicit in his orientation to larger social issues and problems.'

The foregoing discussion suggests certain relationships between values and behavior in a T-group. Specifically, two such relationships are as follows: First, interpersonal interactions in a group may focus on participants' values and explore the implication of these values on the behavior that takes place in the T-group. Second, the trainer in a T-group may attempt to emphasize his set of values and the application of these values in the group.

HYPOTHESES

Two general hypotheses are proposed to investigate the relationship between values and laboratory training, each being followed by specific hypotheses based on the actual content of the KIT's two factors. A third

hypothesis is proposed to test the temporal stability of an individual's interpersonal value constructs. It is expected that 'values' tend to represent fairly stable aspects of an individual's personality. The hypotheses are as follows:

Hypotheses #1: An individual's IVC's affect the interpersonal experiences he has with other individuals in his T-group.

1a: The more an individual utilizes IVC's of *Good Fellowship* versus Functional Task Activity, the more the individual is involved in issues of affection, love and intimacy in his T-group; and the more other individuals are attracted to him.

1b: The more an individual utilizes IVC's of *Functional Task Activity* versus Good Fellowship, the more the individual is experienced as being an effective group member, making the group a success; and being respected by the other individuals in the T-group.

1c: The more an individual utilizes IVC's of *Interpersonal Boldness* versus Restraint, the more the individual tries out new ways of doing things in the group; and gets involved in issues of authority, power, and dependency.

Hypothesis #2: The interpersonal experiences that an individual has with others in a T-group are affected by the individual's IVC's relative to the T-group trainer's IVC's.

2a: The more similar are an individual's IVC's of *Factor 1* and/or *Factor 2* with the T-group trainer's, the more the individual is experienced in a 'positive' manner in his T-group (e.g. via effectiveness, respect, attraction, and is seen as behaving like the trainer and sharing his values).

Hypothesis #3: Individual IVC's do not change as a result of short term interpersonal experiences.

The null hypothesis to the hypotheses under #1 and #2 is that no association exists between the variables as stated.

The first set of hypotheses (#1, 1a, 1b, 1c), involve whether an individual's IVC's can explain some variance in the interpersonal experiences he has with others. The specific predictions were based on rather logical considerations. In the case of hypothesis 1a, individuals who get involved in issues of affection, love and intimacy, and who are the source of interpersonal attraction, are expected to be more apt to utilize IVC's of Good Fellowship (e.g. affection, forgivingness, cheerfulness, etc.). The latter IVC's seem to parallel the content of the interpersonal issues of affection. The same logic has been applied in formulating hypotheses 1b and 1c. In the former case, the

IVC's of Functional Task Activity include 'capability', 'responsibility', and 'intellect', which would seem to be utilized by individuals concerned with making the group a success, being an effective group member, and fostering respect (presumably based on expertise and competence). In the latter case, the IVC's of Interpersonal Boldness include 'courage', 'independence', and 'imagination', which seem to parallel an individual's trying out new interpersonal behavior and perhaps getting involved in issues of authority etc. (by challenging the status quo of group norms or expectations).

The second set of hypotheses (#2, 2a), involve the relationship between an individual's interpersonal experiences and his IVC's in relation to the T-group trainer's IVC's. This formulation of hypotheses was based on a growing literature that suggests the important role of the trainer in influencing the scope of behavior that goes on in a T-group. In particular, the studies by Peters (1966), Culbert (1968), Cooper (1969), and Smith and Pollach (1969) indicate that the trainer acts as a model to the participants in the group, and that his behavior, attitudes, and values become guides to behavior in the group. In addition, the studies on values and psychotherapy (summarized by Kessel and McBrearty, 1967) give considerable evidence that a therapist's values are communicated to the patient and that some degree of value similarity between therapist and patient is necessary for an effective interpersonal relationship. Given the central role of the trainer in a T-group, it seems reasonable to expect value similarity between trainer and participant to affect the interpersonal experiences of the participant. Consequently, Hypothesis 2a states this expectation, i.e. trainer-participant similarity of IVC on *Factor 1* and/or *Factor 2* is related to 'positive' or effective experiences for the participant. At a minimum, such similarity would be conducive to communication and understanding between trainer and participant.

The third hypothesis involves the stability of IVC's as measured by the KIT. The assumption is that an individual's IVC's are fairly stable traits and are not expected to change after short term interpersonal experiences. This assumption is consistent with the KIT as a projective test, the method typically expected to assess the more 'deeper' and fundamental traits of an individual (Murstein, 1965). A standard test-retest procedure would be the logical research design to test this hypothesis. However, since IVC's are defined in the context of interpersonal behavior, it seems that a rigorous test of the stability of this trait would be a test-retest during constant and intense interpersonal experiences, as found in a T-group.

RESEARCH DESIGNS

For the purpose of investigating the hypotheses stated in the previous section, two designs were utilized which involved the assessment of the KIT and other instruments. These designs are presented below and whenever some analysis is shown, *Design I* or *Design II* will be cited as the source of the data.

Design I

Eight sensitivity training groups were involved in this assessment. Seven groups were from the Industrial Relations, Management Programs at UCLA, one group was obtained from the UCLA Extension University Program. Of the 82 individuals who participated, 47 were male and 35 were female, and were distributed fairly equal among the groups. The Industrial Relations Program was composed of individuals in responsible positions in business, government and civic organizations: educators, lawyers, physicians, psychologists, clergymen, and others. The single group from the Extension University, while not containing such professional individuals, was composed of white collar members of the business community. The groups ranged from 10 to 13 members, with one trainer per group. There were all together four male trainers and four female trainers.

The goals of the Industrial Relations Program are as follows: that each individual learn more about himself and his impact on others, understand his own feelings and how they affect his behavior toward others, learn how people affect groups and groups affect people, and learn how to help groups function more effectively. The seven groups from this program met for approximately 30 hours in total. This consisted of two weekend labs separated by five weekly meetings.

The goals of the Extension University Program were similar to the Industrial Relations program. Basically, it was a one semester course in sensitivity training which met one night per week for twelve weeks. There were no noticeable differences between this course and the Industrial Relations Program with respect to: individual and group activities, and individual involvement in the groups.

On the next to the last meeting of the groups, the participants and trainers were administered two instruments by the author that are relevant to this study: the KIT and the Group Perception Questionnaire (to be described shortly). The other instruments administered were a part of different studies. It was felt that these latter instruments would not confound the other assessments in this study.

Design II

Three sensitivity training groups were involved in this research design. These groups participated in a one course program in UCLA's Graduate School of Management that consisted of two weekly two hour meetings for 10 weeks. The students in the groups were a combination of junior and senior undergraduates, and graduate students in the management school. There was a fairly equal distribution of males and females in the groups which ranged from 11 to 14 members in size. Each group was led by two co-trainers who were undergoing a training program in the same school.

At the very beginning of the course, all participants were administered the KIT. At the next to last meeting of the groups, all participants were again asked to respond to the KIT (an interval of approximately 10 weeks). While

the author was not in a position to insist on participants taking the instruments, 24 participants completed both administrations (a 62 per cent response rate).

THE GROUP PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Design 1 included the assessment of a sociometric questionnaire that was designed to measure a variety of interpersonal experiences in a T-group setting. Each participant and trainer in a group was asked to distribute 3 *M*'s and 3 *L*'s among the participants who *most* and *least* fit each description. This instrument was used since an individual's own report of his interpersonal behavior might be biased to be socially desirable. The actual design of the instrument was mostly taken from a study by Peters (1966) who reported considerable success with it in a research study of T-groups.

The first three items of the instrument concern participant involvement in issues of authority, intimacy, and group success. Several research studies have found the significance of these dimensions in small group and T-group settings (e.g. Hare, 1962; Bradford *et al.* 1964; Burke and Bennis, 1961; Friedlander, 1966).

The other sociometric descriptions were chosen to represent some of the typical dimensions studied in T-groups (i.e. participant effectiveness, being like the trainer, being involved and interested). In addition, items regarding the development of respect and attraction among individuals were also included. Because of time constraints in the research design (*Design 1*), it was not feasible to include more than 10 sociometric descriptions in the instrument. It should be noted that the content of the first two hypotheses was based on the items in the Group Perception Questionnaire.

COMPUTATION OF INDICES

Two KIT factor indices were computed for each individual (following standardization of response style), by equally weighting the IVC's that compose each factor, taking into account positive and negative loadings (see McKelvey, 1970, for the construction of measuring instruments by factor analysis).

The second stipulated set of hypotheses involves a comparison between participant and trainer IVC's (value similarity). A profile index was computed for each factor index based on the 'D' statistic (Cronbach and Glaser, 1953). The 'D' statistic is a measure of the difference or distance between individuals' responses. Specifically, a profile index was computed for each participant in a T-group according to the difference between his IVC scores on a factor and the trainer's IVC scores on the same factor (the index is computed as the sum of squared differences since direction is ignored). Two

profile indices for each participant correspond to the two factors of the KIT instrument.

For each participant in a T-group, a sociometric index was computed that represents the manner in which the other participants in the group perceived and experienced him in their interpersonal encounters. Since each participant assigned *M*'s and *L*'s to the three participants who most, and the three participants who least had fitted the sociometric description, respectively, average rankings for each participant on the 10 sociometrics were computed. Also, since the trainer in each group responded to the same sociometric questionnaire, 10 additional indices were available for each participant based on how the trainer perceived and experienced him. The validity of the sociometric ratings is suggested by the agreement between peer ratings and trainer ratings of participant interpersonal behavior as represented on the 10 sociometric descriptions.

Before the statistical analysis to test the hypotheses was performed (*Design 1*), a group by group standardization of all indices was calculated. This standardization made participant and trainer factor indices all relative to a given group. This procedure was designed to minimize any group differences in average factor or profile indices. Such a standardization was congruent with the automatic standardization of sociometric ratings of group members (each individual distributing the same number of *M*'s and *L*'s to the individuals in his group eliminates average group differences in overall perceptions and experiences). In testing the various hypotheses, correlations are thus between two standardized indices.

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis #1.

Table 1 shows the results of computing Pearson correlations between the two factor indices and the 10 peer-rated sociometric indices. Looking at the entire matrix of correlations will permit not only the observation of the hypothesized relationships, but also the relationships not specifically predicted.

Concerning Hypothesis 1a, the *Factor 1* index of *Good Fellowship* versus Functional Task Activity did not relate significantly to an individual's involvement in issues of affection, love and intimacy. Also, the more an individual utilized IVC's of Good Fellowship versus Functional Task Activity the *less* other individuals in the group became attracted to him, opposite as predicted. This latter relationship was statistically significant ($r = -.38$; $p < .001$). Perhaps this finding reflects the research that has found negative relationships between affiliation needs or approval seeking, and measures of popularity and attraction (Shipley and Veroff, 1958; Crowne and Marlow, 1960). Hypothesis 1a was thus not supported significantly as predicted, although alternative research findings can explain the strong relationship found.

TABLE 1

Test for Hypotheses #1: Factor indices related to peer-rated sociometric descriptions (N=82). Intercorrelation of factor indices = -.118

<i>Sociometric Descriptions</i>	<i>Factor 1</i>	<i>Factor 2</i>
	<i>Good Fellowship Versus Functional Task Activity</i>	<i>Interpersonal Restraint Versus Boldness</i>
involved in issues of authority, power and dependency	-.11	-.09
involved in issues of affection, love and intimacy	+.03	-.06
actively sought to make group as successful as possible	-.25*	-.09
behaved much like the trainer and shared his values	-.17	+.03
overall effectiveness as a member has contributed	-.30**	+.10
overall effectiveness as a member has increased	-.29**	+.13
seemed interested and involved in group's activities	-.19 ⁺	-.06
tried out new ways of doing things in the group	-.13	-.04
obtained high level of respect from other group members	-.38***	+.12
was attracted to by other group members	-.38***	+.08

⁺ p < .10
^{*} p < .05
^{**} p < .01
^{***} p < .001

Hypothesis 1b involves the relationship between an individual's use of IVC's of *Functional Task Activity* versus Good Fellowship and interpersonal experiences of effectiveness and respect. This hypothesis receives considerable support. From *Table 1*, the more a participant in a T-group tends to utilize

IVC's as stated, the more the participant was perceived and experienced as: (1) actively striving to make the group as successful as possible ($p < .05$), (2) contributing to the group's progress by his overall effectiveness ($p < .01$), (3) increasing his overall effectiveness as a group member ($p < .01$), and (4) obtaining a high level of respect from other participants ($p < .001$). There was also a tendency for participants who utilize Functional Task Activity constructs versus Good Fellowship to be seen as interested and involved in the group's activities ($p < .10$). (It should be noted that a participant's greater use of IVC's related to Functional Task Activity is related to a lesser utilization of IVC's reflecting Good Fellowship, resulting from the positive and negative loadings on *Factor 1*).

Hypothesis 1c concerns the relationships between an individual's use of IVC's of *Interpersonal Boldness* versus *Restraint* and two sociometric descriptions: trying out new ways of doing things in the group, and getting involved in issues of authority, power and dependency. Both relationships did not approach significance, e.g. greater use of IVC's of Boldness as opposed to Restraint was expected to relate to the manifestation of these descriptions. Thus, Hypothesis 1c is not supported.

Hypothesis #2.

Table 2 shows the correlations between the two profile indices representing participant-trainer value similarity and the ten peer-rated sociometric indices (the profile index is in the direction of greater similarity). The entire matrix of correlations is shown so that all possible relationships can be observed.

Hypothesis 2a states: The more similar are an individual's IVC's of *Factor 1* and/or *Factor 2* with the T-group trainer's, the more the individual is experienced in a 'positive' manner in his T-group, and is seen as behaving like the trainer and sharing his values. First, looking at the profile index of *Factor 1*, nine out of the 10 correlations with this profile index and the sociometrics is positive ($p < .05$ by the sign test, Siegel, 1956). The one relationship that is negative is for the sociometric description of 'involved in issues of authority, power, and dependency'. This description is seemingly the least positive statement of interpersonal behavior in the groups, relative to the other descriptions (e.g. effectiveness, respect, attraction, being interested). Therefore, support for Hypothesis 2a with *Factor 1* IVC's is evidenced.

Concerning participant-trainer value similarity on *Factor 2*, the general findings seem to be reversed. That is, opposite from prediction, greater dissimilarity on *Factor 2* is related to an individual being experienced in a 'positive' manner on eight out of 10 sociometric descriptions ($p < .05$ by the sign test). The sociometric which most violates this general finding is the description 'involved in issues of authority, power, and dependency'. This is the same sociometric description that differed from the general pattern of relationships found for *Factor 1*, only this time it does fit the prediction.

The investigation of Hypothesis 2a has thus found support for *Factor 1*

TABLE 2

Test for Hypothesis #2: Profile indices¹ related to the peer-rated sociometric descriptions. (N=74)². Intercorrelation of profile indices = -.07.

<i>Sociometric Descriptions</i>	<i>Profile 1:</i>	<i>Profile 2:</i>
	<i>Similarity on Good Fellowship versus Functional Task Activity</i>	<i>Similarity on Interpersonal Restraint versus Boldness</i>
involved in issues of authority, power and dependency	-.23*	+.15
involved in issues of affection, love and intimacy	+.24*	-.19 ⁺
actively sought to make group as successful as possible	+.19 ⁺	-.26*
behaved much like the trainer and shared his values	+.14	-.10
overall effectiveness as a member has contributed	+.19 ⁺	-.24*
overall effectiveness as a member has increased	+.07	-.06
seemed interested and involved in group's activities	+.18	-.27*
tried out new ways of doing things in the group	+.06	-.16
obtained high level of respect from other group members	+.13	-.01
was attracted to by other group members	+.13	+.02

¹ Profile indices are based on 'D' statistic between participant and trainer; profile indices are in direction of greater similarity.

² One trainer did not complete the KIT and therefore, his group had to be excluded from this analysis.

+ p < .10

* p < .05

profile relationships, while those for *Factor 2* are significantly opposite to prediction. A tentative explanation of this latter finding concerns the possible analogy of Interpersonal Restraint (IVC's) as trainer 'non-directiveness' and Interpersonal Boldness as trainer 'directiveness'.

For example, trainers who tend to be *non-directive* in that they expect the participants to influence and carry the responsibility for the focus of interpersonal behavior, might implicitly reinforce participants who apply IVC's of Interpersonal *Boldness* (so the participants can control some of the group's activities). To the extent that participants are affected by trainer cues that suggests such complementarity of behavior (as the literature on trainer behavior implies), participants may come to perceive and experience one another's behavior in the group positively according to dissimilarity on trainer-participant *Factor 2* IVC's. (This explanation is consistent with the negligible correlations between the *Factor 2* profile index and the sociometric indices of respect and attraction, the descriptions least specific to a T-group situation.)

The one sociometric perception that deviates most from the foregoing discussion concerns participants who are seen as getting involved in issues of authority, power and dependency, which is consistent with the foregoing explanation. For this issue, trainer-participant value similarity on *Factor 2* is associated with this type of interpersonal experience ($r = +.15$). It seems that a trainer acting on restraint and a participant acting on restraint (e.g. both being passive and non-directive), or a trainer and participant both acting on boldness (e.g. both being directive) may result in an authority struggle over which 'role' the trainer and participant should differentially attend to, as reflected in the application of IVC's parallel to these behaviors. It is also of interest that the authority sociometric was the only one that deviated from the other relationships of *Factor 1* profile index. In this case, dissimilarity of trainer-participant values was associated with this interpersonal experience ($r = -.23$; $p < .05$). Since the trainer is the primary authority figure in the T-group, such a finding in retrospect, seems plausible. If a participant utilized IVC's of *Factor 1* differently than the trainer, the former may be perceived as countering the authority of the latter, in terms of what will be the focus of evaluative considerations, Good Fellowship or Functional Task Activity.

In order to ascertain whether the preceding analysis is appropriate to the concept of 'value similarity' (i.e. value comparisons ignoring the direction of differences), or the concept of differences from a given value, *Table 3* is presented. From this table it is evident that there are no mean differences between trainer's IVC's and participant's IVC's. Therefore, it seems that the discussion of Hypothesis 2a was appropriate as presented, since the profile indices did not favor differences from a particular IVC focus of the trainers.

Since the validity of the findings from Hypothesis #1 and #2 is partly based on the validity of the sociometric indices, it is necessary to inquire how good these latter measures are. While the investigator was not able to independently assess actual participant behavior and compare it to the

TABLE 3

Comparison of trainer and participant KIT values. (Design I)

<i>KIT values</i>	<i>Trainers (N = 7)</i>	<i>Participants (N = 74)</i>	<i>T-test</i>
Factor 1: mean	-39.9	-36.3	n.s.
standard deviation	22.7	36.0	
Factor 2: mean	-17.7	-15.1	n.s.
standard deviation	12.5	28.5	

sociometric ratings he received, the trainers in each T-group rated each participant on the same sociometric questionnaire. The average correlation of the peer-rated versus trainer rated sociometric indices is $r = .38$ ($p < .001$). While this correlation is not exceedingly high, it does indicate a reasonable correspondence of interpersonal perceptions from different sources (i.e. fellow participants versus experienced T-group trainers). Consequently, it seems safe to assume that the sociometric indices represent a valid assessment of the interpersonal behavior that took place in the T-groups.

Hypothesis #3.

Throughout the discussion of results, the several significant findings have been described as if values affected interpersonal experiences; or that value profile comparisons between participant and trainer led to certain sociometric ratings. Since this validity study was correlational, and especially since the assessment of values and sociometrics both took place at the end of the T-group laboratory, other interpretations are certainly plausible.

To begin with, instead of interpersonal value constructs affecting interpersonal experiences, these latter experiences might have influenced participants and trainers to respond to the values in the KIT in a consistent manner with these experiences. For example, a participant who gets feedback from other participants telling him that they see him as an 'effective group member' might lead the participant to emphasize the values on the KIT relating to Functional Task Activity, as a projection of his own recent experience. This participant's response to the KIT would probably have been different if assessment had been made prior to the T-group meetings (based on the foregoing interpretation). Similarly, those participants who

experienced the 'positive' sociometric perceptions may have changed their interpersonal value constructs to be in line with the trainer's constructs, as a consistent response to emulating the trainer (adopting his values as well as his behavior). This latter interpretation is compatible with the literature review on trainer interventions in T-groups, and thus is a plausible alternative explanation for the findings on Hypothesis 2 (a similar argument can be made for participant values changing to be more different from the trainer's).

In order to address the above issues, the third hypothesis can be investigated: Participant interpersonal value constructs do not change as a result of short term interpersonal experiences. If this hypothesis cannot be rejected, then it would seem that values affect interpersonal experiences and not vice versa (i.e., if KIT values do not change as a result of a T-group experience).

Table 4 shows the mean factor indices of the before and after assessments of individuals who participated in a ten week sensitivity training course (*Design II*). The T-tests of mean differences between the time interval for both KIT factors are far from significant. In addition, Table 4 also shows the

TABLE 4

Test for Hypothesis #3: Before and after assessment of the KIT for T-group participants, Design II, N = 24

<i>KIT</i>	<i>Before T-group</i>	<i>After T-group</i>	<i>T-test</i>
Factor 1: mean	-.35	-.38	n.s.
standard deviation	28	33	
Factor 2: mean	-.11	-.08	n.s.
standard deviation	28	28	
<i>KIT</i>		<i>'test-retest' coefficient</i>	
Factor 1		+ .70	
Factor 2		+ .63	

'test-retest' correlations for both factor indices. Given that the time interval was 10 weeks, and that the participants were involved in considerable interpersonal interactions, the correlations suggest that IVC's are fairly stable ($r = +.70$ for *Factor 1*; $r = +.63$ for *Factor 2*); and the t-tests suggest that individual IVC's do not change as a result of short term interpersonal experiences. Thus, it seems that values affect interpersonal behavior more than vice versa, at least in the short run.

CONCLUSIONS

The present study has found some evidence that individual values (specifically, interpersonal value constructs), are related to laboratory training. In particular, the observed relationships between participant-trainer value comparisons and sociometric perceptions highlights the effect that different trainers are likely to have on different participants. Independent of this effect, participants tend to experience interpersonal relationships based on their use of IVC's (not specific to a given T-group). The application of IVC's may thus be a significant process which can help account for the interactions and learnings that take place in T-groups. Also, the use of a projective assessment of values, such as the KIT, may tap the deeper and partly unconscious process by which values translate into behavior. Bringing this underlying process to a conscious level of awareness and investigation, may certainly add to the knowledge of values and interpersonal behavior.

For example, one of the most interesting empirical findings of this study was that *Factor 1* value comparisons between participant and trainer, had different effects than *Factor 2* value comparisons. Typically, the literature of counselor-client value comparisons indicates that value similarity of some degree may be a necessary state for certain learnings to occur for the client (see Kessel and McBrearty, 1967). A qualification to this generalized statement might be in order. Specifically, for some values, dissimilarity between counselor and client may be more functional to the relationship than similarity. This was the case for *Factor 2* comparisons for participants and trainers. If a trainer was oriented to directiveness (parallel to Boldness), then participants who applied values relating to Interpersonal Restraint were experienced by other participants in 'positive' ways (e.g. making the group a success). The same is true for the opposite set of conditions, trainer emphasizing non-directiveness (parallel to Restraint), and participants applying IVC of Interpersonal Boldness. Being able to specify why certain value comparisons have different effects on interpersonal relationships would certainly enhance our understanding of an effective helping relationship.

Another interesting finding from the current study is the strong relationships between an individual's use of Functional Task Activity versus Good Fellowship IVC's, and the individual obtaining a high level of respect and being attracted to by other individuals (for both correlations, $p < .001$). This finding may have important implications for an explanation of these

sociometric processes. In other words, interpersonal respect and attraction may result from an individual utilizing certain IVC's in general, aside from the similarity or dissimilarity of his values with other individuals. A better understanding of this finding could add to our knowledge of developing these kinds of interpersonal experiences.

The current study also has some important implications to the area of organizational development (see Schein *et al.*, 1969). For example, an important link between a change agent and a client system is the kind of interpersonal relationship that is established between the change agent and the representatives of the client system. In particular, if the values between these parties conflict with regard to the object and process of organizational change, then a successful project may not be possible (Bennis, 1966; Argyris, 1970). Perhaps the KIT might be able to enhance our understanding of an effective change agent-client relationship in an organizational development effort. This entire area is certainly open to research that seeks to study the development of 'positive' interpersonal experiences. The results from the current study suggest that values as measured by the KIT affect this process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Ken Thomas for his helpful suggestions and support. I am also appreciative of the Institute of Industrial Relations of UCLA for making available the Spring 1971 Program of Sensitivity Training. The Campus Computer Network of UCLA provided the funds for the statistical analysis.

REFERENCES

- ALLPORT, G. W., VERNON, P. E. & LINDZEY, G. (1951). *A study of values*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- ARGYRIS, C. (1970). *Intervention theory*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- BENNE, K. D., BRADFORD, L. P. & LIPPITT, R. (1964). 'The Laboratory Method'. In: L. P. Bradford, J. R. Gibb & K. D. Benne (eds), *T-group theory and laboratory method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 15-44.
- BENNIS, W. G. (1966). *Changing organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- BENNIS, W. G. (1970). 'Goals and meta-goals of laboratory training.' In R. T. Golembiewski & A. Blumberg (eds) *Sensitivity training and the laboratory approach*. Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- BRADFORD, L. P., GIBB, J. R. & BENNE, K. D. (1964). *T-group theory and laboratory method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- BURKE, R. L. & BENNIS, W. G. (1961). 'Changes in perception of self and others during human relations training,' *Human relations*, 2 165-182.

- COOPER, C. L. (1969). 'The influence of the trainer on participant change in T-groups,' *Human relations*, 22 #6, 515-530.
- CRONBACH, L. J. & GLASER, G. C. (1953). 'Assessing similarity between profiles,' *Psychological bulletin*, 50 456-473.
- CROWNE, D. P. & MARLOWE, D. (1960). *The approval motive: studies in evaluative dependence*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- CULBERT, S. A. (1968). 'Trainer self-disclosure and member growth in two T-groups,' *Journal of applied behavioral science*, 4 #1, 47-73.
- FRIEDLANDER, F. (1966). 'Performance and interactional dimensions of organizational work groups,' *Journal of applied psychology*, 50 257-265.
- GOLEMBIEWSKI, R. T. & BLUMBERG, A. (eds) (1970). *Sensitivity training and the laboratory approach*. Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- GORLOW, L. & NOLL, G. A. (1967). 'A study of empirically derived values,' *Journal of social psychology*, 73 261-269.
- HARE, A. P. (1962). *Handbook of small group research*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- KESSEL, P. & McBREARTY, J. F. (1967). 'Values and psychotherapy: A review of the literature,' *Perceptual and motor skills*, 25 669-690.
- KILMANN, R. H. (1972). 'The development and validation of a projective measure of interpersonal values,' U.C.L.A. unpublished dissertation.
- McKELVEY, W. (1970). 'On developing efficient statistically significant measuring instruments by factor analytic technique,' U.C.L.A., unpublished research paper, #28.
- MORRIS, C. (1956). *Varieties of human values*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MURSTEIN, B. I. (ed.) (1965). *Handbook of projective techniques*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- PEPPER, S. C. (1958). *The sources of value*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- PETERS, D. R. 'Identification and personal change in laboratory training groups,' Massachusetts Institute of Technology, unpublished dissertation.
- ROKEACH, M. (1969). *Beliefs, attitudes and values*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- SCHEIN, E. H., BECKHARD, R. & BENNIS, W. G. (1969). *Organization development*. Addison-Wesley series.
- SHIPLEY, T. W. & VEROFF, J. (1958). 'A projective measure of need for affiliation.' In: J. W. Atkinson (ed.) *Motives in fantasy, action and society*. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc.
- TANNENBAUM, R. & DAVIS, S. (1970). 'Values, man and organizations.' In: W. Schmidt (ed.). *Organization frontiers and human values*, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

RALPH H. KILMANN is Assistant Professor of Business Administration at the Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh. He received his B.S. and M.S. in Management Science from Carnegie-Mellon University, and his Ph.D. in Management from the University of California at Los Angeles.