SENSITIVITY TRAINING AND ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

by

Robert E. Tozier
BA, Bowling Green State University, 1959
BS, Bowling Green State University, 1959

Submitted to the Department of Speech and Drama and the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Redacted Signature

Instructor in charge

Redacted Signature

For the Department

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To numerous individuals in and out of the Army I am indebted for information and documents--not to mention encouragement and advice--crucial to this study. Special appreciation goes to Chaplain Billy W. Libby of the United States Army Chaplain Board, who directed me to sources (and sources to me) over a period of months.

My thanks also go, of course, to Dr. Bobby Patton for his service as adviser, and to Dr. Kim Giffin, Dr. William Conboy, and Dr. Paul Friedman, who assisted in a variety of ways.

Robert E. Tozier

CONTENTS

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Carl Rogers recently listed "various areas of modern life in which the intensive group experience seems to have possibilities for constructive use." He included industry, churches, families, educational institutions, and government, and the problem areas of race relations, international tensions, and the generation gap. In the areas of government and international tensions, brief mention was made of efforts in the State Department, "various federal government departments," and "groups of high-ranking state employees." But omitted from the list and discussion was any mention of the military establishment,[1] and the omission is typical of the literature on laboratory training.[2] The present study, then, was undertaken to investigate--in broad terms--the "possibilities for constructive use" of laboratory training in the military. For practical reasons, however, the scope of the study has been limited to the normal military environment in the United States Army. That

---

[1] Carl R. Rogers, Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), pp. 135-141.

[2] The term "laboratory training" has been selected for primary use in this study. Its use in place of Rogers' "intensive group experience" is supported by his discussion of terminology, p. 1.

is, excluded from the study were laboratory training applications with prisoners, victims of alcohol and drug abuse, and the mentally ill, for example; applications with military dependents and civilian employees; and applications in the other services.[3]

Some philosophy and research on laboratory training has special significance for military applications. The following examination of selected aspects of the field serves to define laboratory training and forms of training as they apply in this study.

LABORATORY TRAINING

Characteristics

Several authors have attempted to describe laboratory training, and to distinguish it from therapy, on the one hand, and conventional education, on the other. Egan, notably concerned with the psychological aspects of training, has listed these characteristics:

---

[3]Dependents and civilian employees were participants in some of the laboratories described in this study. In most cases, however, their participation was incidental only. As an exception to the scope of this study, one case designed primarily for civilian employees has been included because of some military participation and the nature of the research conducted with those personnel. Navy chaplains have had some involvement in laboratory training as well. See Cyril R. Mill, "A Changing Concept of the Chaplaincy," Military Chaplains' Review, II (January, 1973), 28. Some Marine involvement is suggested by two articles on nonverbal communication; see Andrew Schneider, "Understanding Body Language," and "Your Body's Shouting So Much I Can't Hear What You're Saying!" Family (published by Army Times), (January 17, 1973), 6-7, and 8-9.

1. Learning through actual experience in small groups.

2. A climate of experimentation.

3. A group size " small enough to allow each participant the opportunity to contribute to the interaction of the group," but "large enough to allow the participants to space their contributions" based on the demands of the group and the individual's needs and capabilities.

4. Feedback.

5. Leadership in the form of a trainer or facilitator.

6. Dealing with emotions and their effects on the communication processes.

7. Support, or "security measures," to match the demanded anxiety-arousing behavior.

8. Ambiguity (although this may be mitigated when it is counter to the laboratory goals).

9. Exercises.

10. Participants drawn from normal rather than psychiatric populations.[4]

Gibb stressed even more clearly the distinction between training and therapy by noting that laboratory training focuses on the "here and now," and deals with the available interpersonal experiences within the group,

---

[4]Gerard Egan, Encounter: Group Processes for Interpersonal Growth (Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1970), pp. 5-9.

studies group processes and actions between members, provides the opportunity for members to try new behaviors, and seeks for members seen by themselves and the trainer as normal to experience personal growth. Not normally characteristic of laboratory training would be primary interest in historical information which members might bring to the group from their organizations or families, analysis of unconscious motivations which may lie behind experiences in the group, the study of leader-member relationships, new insight or motivation, or participants drawn from other than normal populations.[5] Many of the same characteristics of laboratory training, especially its experiential focus, help distinguish it from forms of traditional education as well.[6]

Varieties

Some described laboratory training as

> . . . a variety of small group experiences which range from intensive, emotionally cathartic, personalized encounter groups to highly skill-oriented leadership and team development programs and including groups focusing on sensitivity to others, personal growth,

---

[5]Jack R. Gibb, "The Effects of Human Relations Training," in Allen E. Bergin and S. L. Garfield (eds.), Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change (New York: Wiley, 1971), p. 840.

[6]William S. Latta, William F. Hummel, Jr., Sebastian Striefel, John S. Morrison III, and Jim L. Olsen, "Human Relations Training in the Army," a paper read at the Annual Current Trends in Army Medical Department Psychology conference, December 1-5, 1969, Denver, and published by the Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., p. 174.

helping others, conflict resolution, community action, racial relations, and executive development.[7]

Rogers briefly described and named a number of laboratory training groups. Several of them are closely related and are grouped together to outline two forms of training which are of special interest in this study. The first grouping is of the T-group, encounter group, and sensitivity training group. Rogers has described the T-group as originally focusing on the development of human relations skills, but recognized that the title has more recently been applied to a wider range of laboratory experiences. The encounter group he described as an experiential process for personal growth and the improvement of interpersonal communication. And sensitivity training he considered a term commonly used to refer to either the T-group or encounter group.[8] Gibb also equated sensitivity training with the T-group, but distinguished such training from the encounter group, which he described as "therapy for normals" focusing primarily on openness of communication of a person with himself and others.[9] Thomas highlighted the similarities and differences between the encounter group and T-group. Both, he wrote, are frequently composed of eight to fifteen members, relatively unstructured, interested in the "here and now," and employ feedback of members to each other to

---

[7]Latta and others, p. 173.

[8]Rogers, pp. 4-5. [9]Gibb, pp. 851-852.

develop new images and behaviors. The primary interest of the T-group, as defined by Thomas, is the group, and members learn about the group process by building their own group. The trainer serves as an ideal, but reserved, group member. Thomas described the encounter group trainer as more active and directive, leading the group in the revealing of the inner self, and assisting in the pursuit of personal growth. This form of training would often be the most intense and personally involving of the two types of groups. Another distinction made by Thomas was that the T-group is conducted largely on the verbal level, while the encounter group also deals with the nonverbal elements of human communication.[10] Another position has been expressed in the catalog for the Midwest Center for Human Potential: encounter groups were known "in olden days" as T-groups or sensitivity training.[11]

In this study the primary term for these forms of laboratory training will be "sensitivity training," although the other terms will also appear, primarily when one or the other appears to be the preference of authors cited. Egan considered the term sensitivity training "loaded." No other

---

[10] M. Duane Thomas, "Developing Human Potential Through Group Interaction: A Study of Changes in Personality Factors, Personal Attitudes, and Group Functioning in University Students Participating in Human Relations Training (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Kansas, 1970), pp. 31-33.

[11] Oasis Midwest Center for Human Potential, Summer 1973 Catalog, p. 2.

expression was considered to be any less loaded, however, including Egan's preferred terms, such as "a self-actualization and interpersonal growth experience, a laboratory in basic human relations, or a laboratory in interpersonal relations."[12]

The second grouping of Rogers' varieties of laboratory training includes organizational development, team building, and task-oriented groups.[13] The last variety Rogers identified as focusing on the interpersonal elements involved in the tasks of a group, and widely used in industry. The other varieties he described as useful in developing leadership skills, and the formation of close and effective working groups.[14] These varieties of training have become common elements of a program known as organization development (or OD)--a term to be used in this study as a second major variety of laboratory training. These two major forms of laboratory training are not mutually exclusive, however. Their relationship is suggested in this description of sensitivity training by Egan:

> . . . a particular kind of laboratory training in which personal and interpersonal issues are the direct focus

---

[12]Egan, p. 10.

[13]The forms of laboratory training listed by Rogers but omitted from these two groupings are sensory awareness, body awareness, body movement, creativity, Gestalt, and Synanon.

[14]Rogers, p. 5.

> of the group. Other goals, such as learning about group processes and developing skills for diagnosing group and organizational behavior, are not eliminated, but they are incidental and therefore subordinated to the goal of dealing with personal and interpersonal deficiencies and potentialities.[15]

Rogers suggested that organization development "does not differ greatly from the personal development which is the goal of most encounter groups."[16] However, the use of sensitivity training in organization development is not universally accepted. Burke recognized the possibilities for the use of the T-group in organization development, but indicated that it was not an essential element.[17] Cyril Mill, on the other hand, has rejected the T-group as a respectable concept for modern-day organization development. The "'therapy' or 'sensitivity training' approach," Mill stated, has long been discarded by "professional OD consultants."[18]

Burke has described five major "interventions," a mixture of laboratory training with other techniques, which are commonly used in organization development. One intervention, training, may take the form of education in

---

[15]Egan, p. 10. [16]Rogers, p. 136.

[17]W. Warner Burke, "A Comparison of Management Development and Organization Development," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, VII (September/October, 1971), 572.

[18]Mill, p. 29. A similar position was also stated in a telephone conversation with the writer, April 30, 1973.

"substantive areas," or training in management skills.[19] Mill also suggested the training of inside trainers and consultants to supplement the use of organization development experts from outside an organization, and the use of human relations training courses away from the organization.[20]

Technostructural interventions involve a range of possible changes, from the rearranging of the physical environment (such as an office), to changes in job descriptions and the structure of the organization.[21]

Data feedback sessions have as their "primary component the analysis and discussion of self-generated data by members of overlapping organizational units."[22] Mill emphasized that such sessions were not sensitivity training, because of the focus on "crucial organizational issues," such as communication patterns, decision-making processes, and personal work satisfaction.[23]

Intergroup problem solving sessions are designed to reduce unproductive conflict between organizational units.[24] Mill suggested that this intervention would commonly follow team building,[25] the fifth intervention listed by Burke, and considered "probably the cornerstone"

---

[19]Burke, p. 575. [20]Mill, p. 28.

[21]Burke, pp. 574-575. [22]Burke, p. 574.

[23]Mill, p. 29. [24]Burke, p. 574. [25]Mill, p. 29.

of organization development.[26] Mill considered data feedback to be a form of team building, the goal of which he saw as the development of an organizational element "to the point where members fully share in common goals and have taken time to work on their interpersonal relationships so that confusion in roles and agendas will not interfere with mission accomplishment."[27]

Mill added a final intervention, consultation, described as the formation of a "relationship with a trusted behavioral scientist," and a difficult process for organizational members.[28]

Hypotheses and Assumptions

Rogers has proposed a set of "practical hypotheses" which attempt to explain the subtle processes within a laboratory training group. They are:

> A facilitator can develop, in a group which meets intensively, a psychological climate of safety in which freedom of expression and reduction of defensiveness gradually occur.
>
> In such a psychological climate many of the immediate feeling reactions of each member toward others, and of each member toward himself, tend to be expressed.
>
> A climate of mutual trust develops out of this mutual freedom to express real feelings, positive and negative. Each member moves toward greater acceptance of his total being--emotional, intellectual, and physical--as it <u>is</u>, including its potential.

---

[26] Burke, p. 574. [27] Mill, pp. 28-29.

[28] Mill, p. 29.

> With individuals less inhibited by defensive rigidity, the possibility of change in personal attitudes and behavior, in professional methods, in administrative procedures and relationships, becomes less threatening.
>
> With the reduction of defensive rigidity, individuals can hear each other, can learn from each other, to a greater extent.
>
> There is the development of feedback from one person to another, such that each individual learns how he appears to others and what impact he has in interpersonal relationships.
>
> With this greater freedom and improved communication, new ideas, new concepts, new directions emerge. Innovations can become a desirable rather than a threatening possibility.
>
> These learnings in the group experience tend to carry over, temporarily or more permanently, into the relationships with spouse, children, students, subordinates, peers, and even superiors following the group experience.[29]

Campbell and Dunnette, after examination of a number of cases of laboratory training, summarized what appeared to them to be the assumptions, although not always explicitly stated, which lay behind the training. One was that the lack of interpersonal competence is a universal malady, shown in distorted self-images, faulty perceptions of others, and poor communication skills. The other assumptions dealt with the behavior of interpersonally incompetent persons assembled in laboratory training groups, and the effects of their behavior. The remaining assumptions were:

1. In-group behavior will be typical of participants' behavior.

---

[29]Rogers, pp. 6-8.

2. Psychological safety will develop within hours of the formation of the group.

3. "A substantial number of group members, when confronted with others' behaviors and feelings in an atmosphere of psychological safety, can produce articulate and constructive feedback."

4. Participants can agree on an exhibited behavior.

5. Feedback will be relatively complete and will deal with significant aspects of the interactions of the group members.

6. Anxiety facilitates new learning.

7. Learnings from the group experience will be transferred to the members' normal environments.[30]

Objectives

The assumption of a universal need for improved interpersonal competence suggests also the tone of the objectives for laboratory training. Gibb has computed the six most commonly stated objectives of training, as he found them in the literature. One is to increase the participant's sensitivity, expressed variously as spontaneity, tolerance of new information, and an awareness of the feelings and perceptions of others. Closely related to this are two other common objectives--functional attitudes toward others, and interdependent behavior. The former

---

[30]John P. Campbell and Marvin D. Dunnette, "Effectiveness of T-group Experiences in Managerial Training and Development," Psychological Bulletin, LXX (August, 1968), 77.

would be shown through reduced prejudice and authoritarianism, and a greater acceptance of others; and the latter, through support for democratic leadership, teamwork, and increased task effectiveness.[31]

The remaining three common objectives, as Gibb found them in the literature, are managing of feelings, managing motivations, and functional attitudes toward self. The first of these refers to the capacity for expressing feelings, and increased owning of them, as well as congruity between feelings and actual behavior. Management of motivations would be shown in self-actualization, and greater energy level. And functional attitudes toward self would result in greater confidence, self-acceptance, and self-esteem, and in congruity of self-image and ideals.[32]

The objectives of organization development are similar to those collected by Gibb, but they have a clear difference in focus. These listed by NTL are typical of those listed by most authorities:

1. To create an open, problem-solving climate throughout the organization.

2. To supplement the authority associated with role or status with the authority of knowledge and competence.

3. To locate decision-making and problem-solving responsibilities as close to the information sources as

---

[31]Gibb, pp. 841-842, 844.

[32]Gibb, pp. 841-842.

possible.

4. To build trust among individuals and groups throughout the organization.

5. To make competition more relevant to work goals and to maximize collaborative efforts.

6. To develop a reward system which recognizes both the achievement of the organization's mission and organization development (growth of people).

7. To increase the sense of "ownership" of organization objectives throughout the work force.

8. To help managers manage according to relevant objectives rather than according to past practices or objectives which do not make sense for one's area of responsibility.

9. To increase self-control and self-direction for people within the organization.[33]

Argyris noted that despite the stated objectives of organization development reference to taking into account the individual within the organization frequently results in distorted images. On one hand, some imagine organization development to be a plot by the organization to make people think they have been taken into account when "we've got them all the time." And others imagine "organizations striving to make people happy, reduce work, treat them with kid gloves."

---

[33] News and Reports, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, II (June, 1968).

But, Argyris continued,

> We are interested in developing neither an overpowering manipulative organization nor organizations that will "keep people happy." Happiness, morale, and satisfaction are not going to be highly relevant guides in our discussion. Individual competence, commitment, self-responsibility, fully functioning individuals, and active, viable, vital organizations will be the kinds of criteria that we will keep foremost on our minds.[34]

Argyris proposed that

> . . . the incongruence between the individual and the organization can provide the basis for a continued challenge which, as it is fulfilled, will tend to help man to enhance his own growth and to develop organizations that will tend to be viable and effective. The incongruence between the individual and the organization can be the foundation for increasing the degree of effectiveness of both.[35]

But some consider the incongruence a significant problem for OD, and but one of several raised in publications on both organization development and sensitivity training. These problems must be considered when examining the effects of training reported for individuals and organizations.

Effects and Problems

A number of authors have attempted to evaluate how well laboratory training has met the stated objectives, and the validity of the assumptions and hypotheses. Gibb, after a survey of research on each of the objectives of laboratory

---

[34]Chris Argyris, Integrating the Individual and the Organization (New York: Wiley, 1964), p. 4.

[35]Argyris, p. 7.

training, each type of laboratory group, and selected other factors, such as group composition, duration, and leader behavior, concluded that the results were "certainly controversial and open to legitimate multiple interpretations." Nevertheless, he felt personally convinced that changes were produced in sensitivity, feeling management, directionality of motivation, attitudes toward self and others, and interdependence.[36] Campbell and Dunnette were likewise cautious. They found the evidence, though limited, convincing that T-group training did induce behavioral changes in "back home" settings. In another area, they were less convinced:

> It still cannot be said with any certainty whether T groups lead to greater or lesser changes in self-perceptions than other types of group experience, the simple passage of time, or the mere act of filling out a self-description questionnaire.[37]

Another study of the effects of T-groups also indicated some evidence of changes, but not overwhelming evidence. Cooper and Mangham found that observers generally agreed that persons who have attended T-groups do show improved skills in diagnosing individual and group behavior, more tolerance and consideration, clearer communication, and "greater action skill" and flexibility; and that the changes lasted "for some time after training, though there are conflicting

---

[36] Gibb, p. 855.

[37] Campbell and Dunnette, pp. 98-99.

reports of fade-out after 10-12 months." Cooper and Mangham also examined the impacts of selected variables on T-group outcomes--such variables as group composition, trainer style, and the course of development during the training. In some areas the research was found to be far from conclusive. One such area was organizational change. The results of research in this area were described simply as "encouraging."[38]

House suggested another dimension to the effects of T-groups used in organization development:

> . . . It has been shown that T-group training is not only capable of inducing anxiety, but that the anxiety is an intended part of the training. Such induced anxiety may have the very unrewarding effect of unsettling, upsetting, and frustrating those subjected to it. The method may also have the intended effect of inducing more consideration for subordinates, less dependence on others, and better communication through more adequate and objective listening.[39]

Lieberman, Yalom, and Miles, while noting that differences in the effects of sensitivity training on group members may be due more to differences between groups than to participation or nonparticipation, concluded from a detailed study of eighteen groups that

> . . . one-third of those who participated in the groups benefited from them, a little over one-third remained

---

[38] C. L. Cooper and I. L. Mangham (eds.), T-Groups: A Survey of Research (London: Wiley-Interscience, 1971), pp. 10, 93.

[39] Robert J. House, "T-Group Education and Leadership Effectiveness: A Review of the Empiric Literature and a Critical Evaluation," Personnel Psychology, XX (Spring, 1967), 22-23.

> unchanged, and the remainder experienced some form of negative outcome: dropping out of the group for psychological reasons, making negative changes, or experiencing psychological decompensation.[40]

The mix of positive and negative results from laboratory training has caused several authors to raise questions and examine problems relating to the use of such training.

Back has cited two problems which are of special interest in this study--the problems of group composition and voluntary attendance. He noted that when used in organization development, sensitivity training groups composed of strangers are often difficult to form, and that groups of friends, associates, or superiors and subordinates create a variety of potential difficulties. Inhibitions, which may counter the mechanisms of sensitivity training, are more likely among non-strangers because of the fear that in-group behavior will be remembered by others and affect relationships in the work environment. On the other hand, uninhibited behavior, such as the revelation of true reactions to a superior, could contribute toward a less effective superior on the job.[41] One report, however, has suggested that training group members may be reassured by the presence of their superiors, knowing that they will not be receiving distorted tales of training activities they

---

[40]Morton A. Lieberman, Irvin D. Yalom, and Matthew B. Miles, "The Impacts of Encounter Groups on Participants: Some Preliminary Findings," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, VIII (January/February, 1972), 49-50.

[41]Kurt Back, Beyond Words: The Story of Sensitivity Training and the Encounter Movement (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1972), pp. 171-172.

attended.[42] House observed that groups should be composed of psychologically stable members--persons able to tolerate the anxiety created by soul-searching, introspection, and examination of personal values and emotions. He recommended screening of potential members to assess their stability and insure freedom from any unusual sources of concurrent psychological stress.[43]

Closely linked to group composition is the problem of attendance--whether it should and can be voluntary. Although Back minimized the psychological risk involved in sensitivity training, he did observe that

> . . . Once voluntary participation stops, participants may not be the kind of people for whom it has been proved to be agreeable. Groups may, on the contrary, include the type of people who have been able to function with a different philosophy, in a different way of life, and for whom this kind of approach may be actually detrimental. It is known, for instance, that many of the best documented instances of breakdown have occurred among people who apparently were successful executives whose company felt that they should be sensitivity trained.[44]

Schein and Bennis have also stressed the need for strictly voluntary attendance for laboratory training. Not only, they have indicated, is learning unlikely under forced participation, but it is unethical for an organization to influence interpersonal behavior. They noted that in-

---

[42]Arthur H. Kuriloff and Stuart Atkins, "T Group for a Work Team," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, II (January-March, 1966), 64.

[43]House, pp. 25-26. [44]Back, pp. 168-171.

sistence on voluntary attendance often resulted in a situation where those who need the training the most refuse to attend, and those who need it least attend readily. To overcome such a problem, they suggested that pressures be avoided, even in organizations using a massive training program, but that individuals be given adequate orientations to enable them to make "meaningful" choices.[45] The question of ethics has been addressed by other authors as well. Back recognized that the sensitivity training group "may be more than . . . the worker bargained for, and the exertion of influence on his life and his feelings may be more than the employer had the right to demand in a work relationship."[46] House raised a series of questions on the ethical aspects of laboratory training in an organization: What responsibility and authority do the manager and the organization have over the personal well-being and privacy of their subordinates? Is it within the prerogatives of management to direct T-group attendance by its employees? If it is not within management's prerogatives to order a person to attend group training, what conditions are necessary to ensure that attendance is strictly voluntary? Can organization training involving T-groups

---

[45]Edgar H. Schein and Warren G. Bennis (eds.), Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach (New York: Wiley, 1965), pp. 215, 231.

[46]Back, p. 169.

ever really be called voluntary? If an individual is overcome by the anxiety induced in the T-group, to what extent should the sponsoring organization assume responsibility?[47]

The major obstacles to voluntary participation have been identified as the subtle influences of glowing reports of training from fellow workers who have attended,[48] the example and recommendations of a superior who attends,[49] and pressures to be part of an organization-wide program.[50] Back has cited evidence of probable involuntary attendance at laboratory training programs:

> Alfred Marrow pointed out that NTL existed on a relatively modest budget of $300,000 until, at his suggestion, the President's Lab was started. Once the presidents of corporations became involved in sensitivity training . . . , the budget of NTL increased tenfold. It is hardly likely that this increased participation occurred without any subtle exercise of power.[51]

Authors have suggested that a primary characteristic of organization development programs is the careful planning and diagnosing of the needs of each organization. This characteristic may hold a partial answer to the problems of group composition and voluntary attendance. One report has illustrated the potential for making the laboratory experience useful to persons who are not the "type" for such training, who get along under another system, as Back

---

[47]House, pp. 27-29. [48]Back, p. 169.

[49]House, pp. 27-28; Back, p. 169.

[50]Schein and Bennis, p. 215. [51]Back, pp. 169-170.

described them. Greening and Coffey reported on a 1962 laboratory for persons selected from volunteers for laboratory training. They were selected for their impersonal manner of relating to others, and were described as intellectualizers, hard-working, overcontrolled achievers with career ambition. Although the course of the laboratory proved far from normal, and not successful by the usual standards, the authors found that the group was not stagnated by their common problem, but that they developed cohesiveness, struggled with their problem, exhibited an unusual reliance on nonverbal techniques to develop an atmosphere of relaxation, trust, and expressiveness, and were rated by more personable members of a larger, mixed group as benefiting substantially from the training.[52] Greening and Coffey's experience suggests that careful screening, then, may be a useful tool, not for selecting out those who are not the type for a particular method of laboratory training, but to help in the designing of appropriate training for varied needs.

Another major problem focuses on the organization, and the effects of laboratory training upon it. Schein inquired whether laboratory training undermines the authority positions in the organization, and whether the

---

[52]Thomas C. Greening and Hubert S. Coffey, "Working with an 'Impersonal' T Group," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, II (October-December, 1966), 402, 410-411.

values and assumptions of the organization are compatible with those of laboratory training. Schein noted two basic values of laboratory training-- a commitment to the spirit of inquiry and the diagnostic approach, and open and honest communication (whenever appropriate). In contrast, the effective use of formal authority

> . . .implies a limiting of communication to task-relevant information and the systematic exclusion of feelings in the interests of efficiency. To teach people the value of being more open and honest, then, may indeed undermine formal authority to a considerable degree.

It was for this reason that Schein advocated care in the selection of training means within organizations, since "training of this sort intervenes in the ongoing organizational system."[53] Back also called attention to the intent of laboratory training to "imbue the whole philosophy of management,"[54] and House asked, "Can the organization tolerate the changes in the individual if the T-Group is successful?"[55] Clearly, then, the nature and needs of the organization must be considered, and in some cases it is possible that an organization will not willingly pay the price of enduring the effects of laboratory training.

The effects of laboratory training on an organization may be seen in the extreme in a case reported by Coulson. With Rogers and others he was involved in a

---

[53]Edgar H. Schein, Organizational Psychology, 2d ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970), pp. 92-93.

[54]Back, pp. 166-168. [55]House, p. 25.

three-year training program for a large Catholic school system in California. "When we started the project," he wrote a year following the close of the program, "there were 600 nuns and 59 schools. . . . Now . . . there are two schools left and no nuns. We did some job." This experience led Coulson to observe that for successful applications of encounter groups in organizations, there must be a willingness to lose individuals.[56] The expense of organizational disruption is especially critical when consideration is given to the possibility that even successful laboratories may produce behavior changes not yet satisfactorily shown to equate with more effective leadership[57] or other benefits to organizational needs.[58]

The study previously cited from Lieberman, Yalom, and Miles indicated that the style of leadership employed in sensitivity training is a major determinant of group outcomes. Although this is not an unexpected discovery,[59] the extreme differences obtained from different styles (differences ranged from a high level of positive results to a high level of negative results) makes the selection

---

[56]William R. Coulson, Groups, Gimmicks, and Instant Gurus: An Examination of Encounter Groups and Their Distortions (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), pp. 99, 153.

[57]House, p. 23.

[58]Gibb, p. 853. Also see Lieberman, Yalom, and Miles, p. 40.

[59]See Gibb, pp. 854-855, on effects of leaders.

of laboratory trainers a major concern.[60] House noted the similarities between group training and "overtly therapeutic processes" in the areas of aroused anxieties, interpersonal feedback, introspection, and self-evaluation, and he recommended that leaders have "psychological training equivalent to that required for professional clinical psychology."[61]

A final problem with laboratory training to be considered here is image. Reference has already been made to the comment by Schein and Bennis that organizational laboratory training is in no way intended to "make people happy" or to assist organizations in manipulation of personnel. Common images of laboratory training persist, however. The encounter group is seriously classified as a "fashionable therapy"--along with drugs and sex.[62] Sensitivity training has been portrayed in jest as a fad response to the excessive use of deodorants.[63] Spectacular exposes appear, as in a recent series in a Chicago newspaper. An introduction to the series began, "'One out of 10 persons who joins an encounter group is liable to become a casualty,' charges psychologist and psychotherapist Bruce

---

[60]Lieberman, Yalom, and Miles, pp. 44-47.

[61]House, p. 27.

[62]Alan Hislop, "Company Men," Saturday Review of the Arts, I (March 3, 1973), 70-71.

[63]Associated Press dispatch, Leavenworth Kansas Times, June 28, 1972.

Maliver, 'about 75,000 persons a year.'" The article concluded by observing that persons naturally feel good after an encounter group, but the ". . . 'danger comes with the inevitable crash which follows, the letdown. It can be more than a potentially suicidal person can cope with.'"[64] Image, then, may be a serious problem for individuals and organizations which otherwise might eagerly seek the assistance of laboratory training.

SOURCES

This study was begun with the presumption that laboratory training was to be encountered only rarely in the Army, and that experience in the field could be exhaustively described. The extent of actual training, however, precluded such a study. The cases of training reported in the study will be, therefore, only representative of the varieties of laboratory experiences in the Army.

Information for the study was generally readily available from several Pentagon offices, NTL, individual chaplains who were or had been involved in laboratory training, and officers and civilians stationed or formerly stationed at Fort Riley, Kansas. Several officers and civilians did not respond to inquiries from this writer, however. In only one case was information acknowledged to be

---

[64]Peter Gorner, "Encounter Groupies, Beware!" Chicago Tribune, April 28, 1973, sec 1, p. 15.

in existence but access deliberately denied. All information on the activities at Fort Ord, California, was refused to the writer in telephone conversations and correspondence with responsible officers at the post. The denial of access was consistent with the policy of the commanding general, the writer was informed, which had also prevented the presentation of scholarly papers or publication of articles on even highly successful instances of training. Useful materials on activities at Fort Ord were available, however, from the Office of the Chief of Staff, Army.

Among the many unpublished sources from official and private files were some which will of necessity be reported anonymously. But in each such case efforts have been made to verify the information from those sources.

In the course of research, numerous indications were noted of laboratory training in the Army which fell beyond the scope of this study. Many medical, correctional, and other applications are being conducted, and have been for years. A major source of training has been civilian laboratories where military personnel have mixed with the regular civilian clientele. Although the attendance records and specific results upon the military persons and their organizations are less clearly identified than for the cases reported in this study, a number of officers have rated these laboratories highly. They have suggested that they may be the most effective source of training for Army

personnel because of the exposure to civilian contemporaries, or a mixture of civilian society; the total break with the military job and environment; and the high quality of training and facilities available most readily at established civilian sites.

This study has been repeatedly scrutinized by the writer to ensure a minimum of personal bias in the treatment of sources. To assist the reader, it appears wise to acknowledge, however, that the writer is an active duty Army officer; has, in the role of commander and of parishioner, enjoyed close associations with Army chaplains; and has participated with other Army officers in sensitivity training under the leadership of Kim Giffin from the University of Kansas, at the United States Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas--an experience the writer considers personally valuable, but one not included in this study.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

This opening chapter has described and noted some of the problems encountered in laboratory training, and particularly its applications in sensitivity training and organization development. Chapter 2 will examine the military establishment from a humanistic perspective, focusing primarily on uses made of laboratory training. It will survey laboratories conducted in 1968 and 1969 by five

Army psychologists and social workers, and describe a wide variety of laboratories in detail, from a half-day seminar to massive organization development programs. Several research reports will also be examined.

Chapter 3 will review the impact of the cases described in Chapter 2, noting the experiences in selected areas of interest in planning, conducting, and evaluating laboratory training in the Army. An assessment will follow in Chapter 4, including a comparison of civilian and military experiences, a critique of Army efforts, and an evaluation of the "possibilities for constructive use" of laboratory training. Chapter 5 will summarize the study and offer conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter 2

ARMY LABORATORIES

Programs of laboratory training have been among attempts to improve the Army with techniques found useful in other segments of the society. But until recent years such training was rare. Theodore Mills mentioned laboratory training for military officers in the mid-1960's,[1] but it was reported in 1970 that "sensitivity training has reached the United States Army" in what was called a pilot project and "perhaps the first of . . . its kind in the Army."[2] Although not wholly accurate, the report reflects the rarity of laboratory training as late as 1970.

The major sections of this chapter will provide a humanistic perspective of the United States Army, and, in four sections, detailed descriptions of representative laboratory experiences. Many of the early laboratory training efforts occurred at Fort Riley, Kansas, and information about other early efforts was recorded by officers stationed there. The first group of laboratory

---

[1]Theodore M. Mills, The Sociology of Small Groups (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967), pp. 91-92.

[2]United Press International dispatch, University Daily Kansan, March 12, 1970. A chaplain told participating commanders, "A life was not intended to be used the way the Army has been using it. You care more for the vehicles in your motor pool than the men under your command."

reports, then, will include the early efforts at Fort Riley and two cases which occurred more recently at the post. Also included will be a 1969 laboratory for professionals, led and reported in part by three Fort Riley officers. Army psychologists and social workers were prominent in the cases in the first group.

The second view of laboratory training will be of a massive organization development program within the chaplain branch. Included will be a description of the role of NTL in the program, reports of three research efforts, and details from two series of laboratories conducted in Germany in 1971 and 1972. The third section will describe a two-year plan for organization development at Fort Ord, California, and instances of training which led to it. And the fourth section will report two independent applications of laboratory training--that is, instances not connected with the chain of activities at Fort Riley, or with the centrally directed programs in progress at Fort Ord and in the chaplain branch.

BACKGROUND

That the military presents a unique environment has been readily granted. Even exponents of humanistic leadership, management, and interpersonal relationships have recognized that the military may in fact be an exception to their philosophies and techniques. House has suggested that the values of better listening, supportive

attitude, and consideration and sensitivity for others may be totally inappropriate for "combat sergeants."[3] Sanford noted that in

> . . . military groups, where there is a life and death emergency, it does not matter if the leader is poor at arranging smooth interpersonal relations. If he can get us out alive, he is acceptable and he will be followed.[4]

And William Coulson observed a certain inapplicability of what otherwise he considered requirements for effective relationships:

> . . . One must suspend his private concerns when mass action is necessary. A war cannot be successfully waged when individual soldiers are honoring their own judgment, reserving to themselves decisions about the veracity of their leaders. Truth cannot be at issue if there is to be a war, for mass action is necessary in war.[5]

But Cyril Mill has accused the Army of relying too strongly on the differences which combat dictates in effective behaviors. In remarks to Army chaplains, he said:

> Not only chaplains but line officers and NCO's need to distinguish more clearly between garrison duty and duty in a combat area. Much of the military psychology seems to be based on the premise that every man must, at any moment, be prepared to do his part in order to "take that hill." Consequently military exigency is frequently used as an excuse for author-

---

[3]House, p. 23.

[4]Fillmore H. Sanford, "Research on Military Leadership," in Flanagan, Current Trends: Psychology in the World Emergency (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1952), pp. 64-65.

[5]Coulson, p. 152.

itarian behavior.[6]

Noting that garrison duty consumes "by far the majority of time spent in military duty," and that the activities of "any peacetime organization" are strikingly similar to military garrison duty, he concluded that the excuse of military exigency was inadequate, and that an "authentic use of power would be better than to cloak it as 'the Army way.'"[7]

While "the Army way" may often block more effective behavior, as suggested by Mill, it may also be, at least in part, a misconception of the Army and military people. Yarmolinsky observed that

> . . . Easy stereotypes of authoritarianism, conformity, aggression, and brutality are common. The evidence to support or refute them is less readily come by. What is clear is that the effort to sort out reality from myth is a crucial one.[8]

On the one hand, one author indicated that "the military mind" is not an idle phrase, but has resulted logically from a system of formal selection and common experiences, friendships, and activities, all within a framework of

---

[6]Cyril R. Mill, in remarks at the Pastors' Conference, March 21, 1973, St. Louis, p. 8. (Mimeographed copy from the Office of the Chief of Chaplains.) Also pp. 12-13, reproduced copy of Mill's draft, from NTL. Subsequent references will be to the chaplains' copy.

[7]Mill, Pastors', p. 8.

[8]Adam Yarmolinsky, The Military Establishment: Its Impacts on American Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 395.

similar routines.[9] Yarmolinsky noted that the military is probably correctly described as an "island of authority in an increasingly permissive society," and that the early training of a soldier includes intentional disruption, "inculcation of unquestioning acceptance of authority, and development of conformity to official attitudes and conduct."[10] An Army psychologist saw a possibly insurmountable difference between humanistic philosophies and those of the Army:

> . . . the largely democratic value orientation implicit in sensitivity training is sometimes difficult to reconcile with the largely autocratic hierarchical caste system which is so much at issue in today's Army.[11]

Persons in and out of the military have always been readily available to point out deficiencies in the military systems, and the need for new forms of behavior. Perhaps a classic is the complaint of a veteran of Vietnam, who claimed that "every time you'd start to feel human, you'd get screwed."[12] In another case, a General Accounting Office survey at Fort Hood, Texas, indicated that of the 600 men surveyed 36 percent were not satisfied with their jobs, and an additional 52 percent said that they were engaged

---

[9] C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 195.

[10] Yarmolinsky, pp. 396-397.

[11] Michael Rohrbaugh, then of Fort Riley, Kansas, in personal correspondence with the writer, January 27, 1973.

[12] Robert J. Lifton, "The 'Gook Syndrome' and 'Numbed Warfare,'" Saturday Review of the Society, LV(December, 1972), 67.

in useful work half the time or less. Fifteen percent reported that they almost never performed useful work. While the survey might well have been contaminated by other factors, such as a general dislike for the military or an intent to leave the service soon,[13] the implications remain.

A career Army officer recently recited the details of his assignment to duty in the Pentagon, an assignment frequently considered a prize and an indication of a successful or promising career. He found himself spending his vacation time and personal funds to relocate his family near the office to which he had been assigned. Upon reporting for duty he found himself unexpected at the office, then reassigned to another office in a distant part of the Washington area, where he was again unexpected and apparently unnecessary. His superior refused to inform him of his duties, until under pressure he announced that they did "what the hell" they were told to do. At a borrowed desk next to the office coffee pot, the officer attempted to discover for himself the nature of his duties.

> Virtually every morning, Army, I left home in the dark without seeing my family, fought that damned traffic for almost an hour, put in a day at the "Building" with a feeling that nobody cared about what I was doing, fought the traffic again, and got home in the dark--too tired many nights to even read the

---

[13] "Troops Call Jobs a Waste," Army Times, April 4, 1973, p. 8.

> newspaper or talk with my family. (I had the same kind of hours when I was "running recruits" for you at basic training in 1960. But back then, the mission was clear and you were showing your trust in me. I'm proud of those long hours.)[14]

Noting that it was a serious matter because of the need for jointly satisfying both human and organizational goals, the officer advised "the Army" to "stand out in the Pentagon's parking areas some morning" and watch the prize-winners reporting for work.

> . . . Look at their faces, Army, and the way they hold their heads and their shoulders and their backs. You've got the perspective of experience, my friend--like nobody else when it comes to managing men. You know troops. Now what kind of troops are these walking into the Pentagon? Do you see pride, dedication, anticipation, esprit-- all those things that you preach to me as hallmarks of a good outfit?[15]

The officer's subjective criticism of the Pentagon assignment, and thereby of the Army, was supported by research conducted with 168 colonels and lieutenant colonels, 81 percent of whom had at one time been assigned to the Pentagon. Of the 168 officers, only 40 indicated a liking for the assignment, and all but 8 of those 40 rated their liking as 1, 2, or 3 on a scale of 1 (low liking) to 5 (high liking). Of the 128 who disliked a Pentagon assignment, over one-third expressed a maximum disliking. The mean rating for all officers was nearly 2 on the dis-

---

[14] Dandridge M. Malone, "The Prize," Army, XXIII (March, 1973), 25-27.

[15] Malone, pp. 27-28.

liking scale. (The mean response for those who had been assigned to the Pentagon exceeded 2, and the response for the others was about 1.5, both on the disliking scale.)[16]

On the other hand, Janowitz has noted a gradual change in the twentieth century "from authoritarian domination toward a greater reliance on manipulation, persuasion, and group consensus."[17] He suggested that it may be commonly overlooked

> . . . that a great deal of the military establishment resembles a civilian bureaucracy, as it deals with problems of research, development, supply, and logistics. Even in those areas of the military establishment which are dedicated primarily to combat or to the maintenance of combat readiness, a central concern of top commanders is not the enforcement of rigid discipline but rather the maintenance of high levels of initiative and morale.[18]

Janowitz suggested that the military has discovered that absolute demands for conformity are often an ineffective method for obtaining high performance,[19] and Yarmolinsky added that a "modern managerialism and a pragmatic sense of the limits of authority have come to pervade wide sectors of the military structure."[20]

---

[16]Malone, pp. 29-31.

[17]Morris Janowitz, The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960), p. 8.

[18]Morris Janowitz, The Military in the Political Development of New Nations (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 119-120.

[19]Janowitz, Soldier, p.8. [20]Yarmolinsky, p. 402.

Other products of military experiences which may be overlooked were suggested in two studies from the 1950's. One indicated that during the basic infantry training cycle at Fort Dix, New Jersey, soldiers improved in their self-esteem and personal adjustment, and in positive relations with their peers.[21] A second study revealed that air cadets showed a decrease in authoritarian predispositions after a year of training.[22]

Several recent indications support the view that the Army is open to new methods for accomplishing the mission. An Army psychologist asked:

> . . . What is the relevance of hair length to combat effectiveness? What would be the consequence of eliminating or modifying the act of saluting? What forms of dissent can the Army tolerate? How far can the decision making process be extended? To what extent can lower ranking enlisted men participate in the decision making that affects them? With these and many more questions we are being pressed for answers. Rather than simply respond to these kinds of questions I believe we need to systematically and thoroughly analyze those behaviors which have been traditional and unchallenged in the Army through the years. Since they are now being challenged by others, it is most rational and prudent that the Army take the initiative in examining its behavioral requirements. Perhaps

---

[21] Richard Christie, Transition from Civilian to Army Life, Technical Report 13 (Washington, D.C.: George Washington University Human Resources Research Office, October, 1954), pp. 9-14.

[22] Donald T. Campbell and Thelma H. McCormack, "Military Experiences and Attitudes Toward Authority," American Journal of Sociology, LXII (March, 1957), 482-490.

> the behavioral scientist can assist in that evaluation.[23]

Papers from the Office of the Chief of Staff, Army, also suggest the possibilities for using the behavioral sciences to improve humanistic management and leadership. The difficulty of teaching trust and confidence, for example, has been acknowledged. The typical Army response has been noted to be ineffective: new doctrine, traveling teams to disseminate the doctrine, letters from the Chief of Staff on professionalism and integrity, and new film on trust and confidence.[24] And attempts have been made to improve the results through the use of new techniques.

Basic to the effective use of the behavioral sciences is knowledge of the target populations. The nature of the personnel who fill three of the Army's key ranks and positions has been suggested in two studies. An Army psychologist made some pertinent observations about the response of noncommissioned officers to an innovation in basic training at Fort Ord, California. There a test program sought to measure the effects of the use of rewards instead of punishment for motivating trainees, and the

---

[23]Charles A. Thomas, Jr., "The Role of the Behavioral Scientist in the Modern Volunteer Army," a paper read at the Annual Social and Preventive Psychiatry Conference, February 8-12, 1971, Washington, D.C., p. 2.

[24]Undated draft briefing papers from the Office of the Special Assistant for Training, Office of the Chief of Staff, Department of the Army, made available to the writer in April, 1973.

experiment yielded largely favorable results. A problem unique with the drill sergeants was reported, however:

> We administered a rating scale questionnaire and solicited written comments from 82 Drill Sergeants who had participated in the . . . test. The results indicated considerable resistance and discontent . . . .
> . . . . . .
>
> It became apparent that many of the Drill Sergeants working with the system did not perceive the need for a change in motivational methods. They seemed to feel that they had grown up under the old system and that they had turned out alright [sic].
> . . . . . .
>
> In his new role the Drill Sergeant must feel, at least initially, that he has lost more than he has gained. He is no doubt resentful of the increased responsibility and the increased voice given the trainee. He no longer can personally determine as many of the contingencies that touch the life of the trainee. In these regards he has lost a sense of personal power and importance--at least in his own eyes.
>
> The reward system requires the Drill Sergeant to be a kind of teacher-technician, rather than a father surrogate. The Drill Sergeant is the coach of a player. The player is motivated by forces outside the purview of the personal magnetism or demagnetism of the coach himself. This is a new role and new roles are not always easy to assume--for any of us.[25]

Yarmolinsky noted that career noncommissioned officers might logically exhibit greater authoritarian and "rigid absolutist military perspectives" than would officers and junior enlisted men, who are more closely linked to the general society through "educational background and skill requirements," and "basic ties," respectively.[24]

---

[25]William E. Datel, "Contingency Management in Basic Combat Training," a paper read at the Annual Current Trends in Army Medical Department Psychology Conference, December 14-18, 1970, Denver, and published by the Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., pp. 115-116.

[26]Yarmolinsky, p. 400.

Two other groups of Army personnel have been tested in research performed under contract for the Department of the Army. In November, 1971, eleven battalion commanders were evaluated, and in August and September, 1972, twelve brigadier general designees were given the same evaluation as they interacted with twelve civilian corporate executives in groups of six officers and six executives.[27]

Both military groups performed poorly in personal relations, as did the corporate executives, although they were all rated "effective and to the point." When compared with other groups evaluated by the contractor, the officers were seen as "less understanding, less able to facilitate genuineness, and communicated less respect." Both military groups and the executives were found through psychological testing to be similar in these respects: they wanted to do well, they were intelligent (top two-and-one-half percent of the population), they possessed personality strength and a high degree of energy and drive, and they displayed broad, diverse interests. The groups differed, however, in several ways. It was found that although none of the groups were what could have been described as creative, the battalion commanders were less creative than either of the other groups. They were the most concerned with standard

---

[27] "CCL Evaluation of Twelve Brigadier General Designees," a memorandum within the Office of the Chief of Staff, Department of the Army, January, 1973.

solutions. The senior officers and civilians were rated as more people-oriented and outgoing. All of the officers were poor at understanding "what makes people tick," but the battalion commanders were lowest of the officer groups in ability to relate to people in a leadership capacity. Both military groups emphasized immediate mission accomplishment and task activities over consideration for people--an orientation opposite that of the executives. It was also found that the battalion commanders were less flexible and adaptive, and functioned less well in unstructured situations than did the other groups.[28]

From the evaluations, three different types of individuals were identified among the brigadier general designees, based on differing internal experiences, attitudes, and values. About half of them were classified as "the dependable cautious managerial type," characterized by dedication to mission, dependability, lack of innovativeness, and a "relative lack of people-relating concern in situations other than those whose outcomes are determined by his authority." (The typical battalion commander also fell into this category.) The other half of the brigadier general designees were about equally divided between the "outgoing managerial type" and the "potentially creative managerial type." The former were classified as rational problem

---

[28]"CCL."

solvers who enjoy being in charge, personally forceful, and high in oral communication skills. They appeared to be better at organizing, analyzing, and deciding than at increasing the performance of subordinates. The potentially creative officers were described as active, mentally independent, curious, and able to perceive "more possibilities" in a situation. "Frequently this type avoids conformity behavior and may appear to rebel against institutional authority." Only individuals in this category, and all of them, favored consideration for people over immediate mission and task activities. Despite the differences noted, however, the behavior of all three types was similar in most situations, although it was concluded that "clear differences in long-term performance outcomes could be expected."[29]

This brief sketch of research and other activities in the behavioral sciences suggests a climate of interest and searching for methods of dealing with serious problems in the Army. The cases of laboratory training which follow confirm the experimental climate; yet they have not been isolated activities, but have been associated with a larger humanizing trend. Reference will be made to this background material in subsequent chapters, which will evaluate the Army's laboratory experiences and offer conclusions and recommendations.

---

[29] "CCL."

PSYCHOLOGIST-LED LABORATORIES

In a paper presented at the Annual Current Trends in Army Medical Department Psychology Conference in December, 1969, five Army officers identified a variety of laboratories conducted since mid-1968 at their home installations and at other installations where they had served as external consultants. They noted that the training had been developmental and experimental, and "often failed to meet our clients' expectations (perhaps needs) for traditional solutions." The experiences were considered successful, however, in helping to develop a body of principles and skills.[30] In this section will be reviewed those early laboratory experiences, including one conducted for psychologists at the 1969 conference, and the principles developed by the five officers. Two of the early efforts which occurred at Fort Riley, Kansas--one with a brief and troubled history, and another which continued for two years--will then be described in detail. And, finally, two more recent Fort Riley laboratories will be described--one of a half-day's duration, and the other a series of five-day laboratories in a continuing program.

Survey, 1968-1969

Described as the most formalized ongoing program was

---

[30]Latta and others, p. 177.

the Command Leadership School at Fort Riley, administered by the Civilian Personnel Officer, but open to all company grade officers, noncommissioned officers, and civilian middle managers at the post. The five-day course offered by the school was intended to provide sound management principles and human relations skills. Two-day workshops were also conducted at the same post for the cadre of the Correctional Training Facility--about 200 persons. Five workshops were held before the program was suspended "for administrative reasons." The workshops had included theory presentations and exercises designed to improve communication and counseling skills.[31] (These two cases will be examined in greater detail later in this section.)

Two three-day workshops were also conducted at Fort Riley for the officers and warrant officers of a maintenance battalion. The goals, similar to those for the Correctional Training Facility, emphasized the development of management and leadership skills. And a five-day program for civilian middle managers at Fort Riley focused on communication and group decision skills.[32]

At Fitzsimmons General Hospital a workshop for military and civilian executives and key noncommissioned officers met approximately semiannually. The three-day

---

[31]Latta and others, pp. 177-178.

[32]Latta and others, p. 178.

workshop presented management theories and provided the opportunity for participants to translate the theories into effective leadership styles. Also at the hospital were conducted one-day workshops in communication and interpersonal skills, and human relations training was conducted for occupation and rehabilitation therapists, psychiatric ward corpsmen, and psychiatric nurses. Training included the use of the T-group as well as more highly structured groups and activities. The participants were students and their immediate directors and instructors.[33]

Sensitivity training was also reported in two-day programs for chaplains at Fort Riley and Fort Sam Houston, Texas. Laboratory training and counseling skills were aims of these programs. Voluntary programs for nursing personnel were offered at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, at the request of the hospital commander, and they were intended to improve the "interpersonal quality of patient care." Five consecutive afternoons were allotted for each of two programs, which began with a focus on individual growth and "progressed through dyadic relationships into group functioning."[34]

At the Medical Field Service Schools, two laboratories were conducted with some of the officers and enlisted instructors. Three programs were conducted with

---

[33]Latta and others, p. 178.

[34]Latta and others, pp. 178-179.

psychology and social work technicians, intended to increase sensitivity. In addition, consultation was offered to the staff to enable it to conduct similar training without the intervention of others. Planned was another program to involve students and their instructors.[35]

The mental hygiene staff, including secretaries, at Fort Devons, Massachusetts, attended a two-day marathon training session. A similar program was conducted at the Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, where mental hygiene personnel attended a two-and-one-half-day laboratory to learn workshop techniques for use with prisoners. A second objective was to assist with organization development of the Mental Hygiene Directorate. An organization development effort was also made at Letterman General Hospital, preceded by laboratory training for psychology interns stationed there.[36]

The five officers indicated that "perhaps the most salient" lesson from the early experiences with laboratory training was that "the military does not function as an alien organization characterized and afflicted by a uniquely specific set of management problems"--that it "is more human than it is anything else." They also stated in detail the major lessons they had learned:

---

[35]Latta and others, p. 179.

[36]Latta and others, p. 179.

1. The higher the point in the power hierarchy from which administrative support comes, the easier will be arrangements to make, the more successful will be the laboratories, and the more widely accepted will be the results.

2. The support and cooperation of immediate supervisors of the participants is essential to insure freedom of choice for them, maintenance of an experimental attitude, and the encouragement of on-the-job change.

3. Laboratory training must maintain an identity separate from other management and leadership training programs.

4. Stable group composition throughout the laboratory, trainer competence in diverse affective and organizational problems, and participant motivation and understanding of the relevance of the training are all essential.

5. Participant evaluations of workshops not only help trainers improve future sessions, but illustrate to the group members the values represented by laboratory training, and help establish support for future efforts.

6. A linking agent is helpful in gaining useful entry of the consultant into an organization or group. The agent should have an adequate understanding of both the laboratory method and the organization, should be able to facilitate communications between the consultant and all levels of the organization, and is an important source of

education about the laboratory process for potential participants.

7. Laboratories are best conducted for a few calendar days, rather than for a few hours once a week over a few months. If used in conjunction with other training, laboratories are best used at the beginning of the program to avoid conflict with other learning, fatigue, and depression; but are effective following other training to assist in integrating laboratory training into the previous instruction, and for generating enthusiasm for the entire program.[37]

Minor learnings were also reported by the five officers, including the observation that one trainer can effectively handle a group of 25 to 50 persons, although it was not considered desirable. Also noted were "variables which confound outcomes and require otherwise unnecessary time-consuming discussion"--the wearing of the uniform, with its rank insignia; meeting during what is normally free time, such as the lunch hour; meetings held at or near the duty station, encouraging interruptions; and performance of regular or extra duties by participants during the period of the laboratory.[38]

---

[37]Latta and others, pp. 179-180.

[38]Latta and others, p. 181.

Laboratory for Professionals

A two-day laboratory was conducted for the Army psychologists attending the 1969 conference. The goals were to provide the participants the opportunity to experience for themselves the effects of a laboratory, and to provide instruction which would help those who wished to conduct laboratories at their home installations. The forty-two participants removed rank insignia and decorations from their uniforms and wore nametags displaying only first names. They were requested to play a variety of roles at each stage of the training: (1) to engage in behaviors called for in the training and to relate these to their feelings, (2) to relate their feelings to their home environments, considering the possibilities for personal change in their official and social behavior, (3) to consider the experiences from the point of view of the trainer to gain insight into the use and timing of the various techniques, and (4) to consider the possibilities for the use of such techniques in their own military assignments.[39]

The trainers described the reactions of the participants as initially angry toward the trainers and the situation. This contributed toward an unexpectedly slow start. However, when the participants had become reconciled to the situation, groups tended to become more like actual

---

[39]Latta and others, pp. 181-182, 184.

T-groups than was intended for the unique purposes of the laboratory. Plans for the second day of training were reformulated to provide less opportunity for T-group-like sessions, and an exposure to a large number of structured exercises. The trainers felt that this would provide both the satisfaction of personal contacts and interaction, and the essential cognitive element.[40] (The training as originally planned, and as actually executed, is described in detail in Appendix A.)

To evaluate their efforts, the trainers used written questionnaires at the close of the laboratory. The evaluation gave some indications that the objectives of the laboratory were achieved. Two of the questions, concerning feelings at the beginning and at the end of the training, indicated a possible alteration in perceptions of the participants' own feelings. Less than half described their feelings as positive at the start of the experience, but six out of seven considered them positive at the end. Only seven of the forty-two participants described their feelings at the start as apprehensive. The responses to another question indicated that the greatest learning was in the area of specific laboratory skills (one of the main objectives of the laboratory), and the next most frequently reported learning was in the area of "self and

---

[40] Latta and others, p. 184.

personal hang-ups" (the other primary objective of the effort). Other responses indicated some "general learning," and two participants reported learning nothing.[41]

A second questionnaire was mailed to the participants one month after the conference. Twenty-two of the forty-two participants responded. Thirteen of those indicated that applications of the training techniques were being planned or carried out, and four others indicated a desire to apply the techniques, but an inability to do so because of student status. Twenty respondents expressed a desire to attend another similar workshop. In individual comments, two indicated that similar future laboratories should be more cognitive, but eight suggested more experiential training.[42]

A primary indicator of the effects of the two-day laboratory was the development of new laboratory training programs by participants. One program was begun at the disciplinary barracks at Fort Leavenworth, and another at Letterman General Hospital. Groups were started with cadets at West Point. It was believed that the conference inspired six psychologists to attend NTL laboratories, and four others to apply for funds to do so. The authors concluded that "thus it seems that the seeds of human relations training programs have fallen on fertile soil." They also identified what they considered possibly the most sig-

---

[41] Latta and others, pp. 185, 189. [42] Pp. 185,190.

nificant result of their effort--an "increase in positive relationships between participants--especially those of different ranks."[43]

Several recommendations were made for future laboratories for professionals. It was suggested that adequate measures be taken to prepare participants in advance for the experience, thereby reducing the uncertainty and anger. A longer laboratory was also considered an improvement, allowing separation of the experiential and cognitive elements. It was felt that the experiential element should last for two or three days, followed by one or two days for the cognitive portion.[44]

Two Early Fort Riley Laboratories

Background. Three of the trainers in the preceding case were involved in a wide range of laboratories at Fort Riley. The impulse for the training originated in the post's Mental Hygiene Clinic, which the officers viewed as having no apparent long-term effects, serving only as a last resort for persons in a crisis. Latta, Striefel, and Morrison have cited two factors which contributed toward their involvement in laboratory training: their training as psychologists and social worker to deal with groups of

---

[43]Latta and others, pp. 185-186.

[44]Latta and others, p. 186.

"normal" people, and the liberal regulations which governed their activities, "allowing for much individual initiative."[45]

Thus it was that efforts were initiated to make the community aware of the clinic resources, aid individuals and groups to acquire skills for helping others, establish channels of communication with the community, and identify individuals in the community groups who could serve both as catalysts in their groups, and as links to the clinic. Clinic officers established consulting relationships through informal luncheon meetings and then arranged for workshops.[46] The two- to five-day workshops

> . . . represented a blend of Behavior Modification, Clinical Psychology and Human Relations topics such as effective leadership, group decision-making, counseling, and communication processes.

Typically, short lectures were followed by group activities and discussions focusing on "communication patterns, leadership struggles, decision making, data generating techniques, and blockages to group effectiveness." Occasionally soldiers with actual problems were brought

---

[45]Sebastian Striefel, "A New Role for Mental Health Professionals in the Army," a paper read at the Annual Current Trends in Army Medical Department Pstchology Conference, December 1-5, 1969, Denver, and published by the Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., p. 165. Also available in an unpublished paper by Striefel, John S. Morrison III, and William Latta. Subsequent references will be to the first listed paper.

[46]Striefel, p. 166.

to a group so that participants could practice counseling and problem-solving techniques. The results were reported to be useful both to the soldiers and the group members.[47]

Groups were drawn from the Correctional Training Facility, social workers at that facility, post chaplains, officers and noncommissioned officers of entire battalions, Medical Service Corps officers, elementary school teachers, military wives, and other elements of the post community.[48] The variety of clients with their unique needs dictated a variety of goals and techniques. Some laboratories were designed to improve interpersonal skills and increase self-understanding. In another case a commander sought a more efficient unit, and training was conducted under the agreement with the commander that he would not only lend the activity his verbal support, but personally participate.[49]

Some of the principles learned in the early efforts at Fort Riley were included in the previously cited "major learnings" from the 1968 and 1969 laboratories. Additionally it was found at Fort Riley that the "linking agent" was not only potentially valuable, but that some agents became problems when the position was self-serving, or a linking

---

[47]William Latta and Sebastian Striefel, "A Workshop Approach to the Army Community," a paper read at the American Psychologists' Convention, September 4, 1969, pp. 3-4.

[48]Latta and Striefel, p. 4. [49]Striefel, pp.166-168.

agent who might verbalize well the basics of laboratory training showed a lack of real understanding.[50] Training time was frequently too short. Some participants were not free from their jobs, and others had to "moonlight." Commanders were not always cooperative. Extreme educational differences among participants was partially overcome by the experiential nature of the laboratories, but remained a significant factor. Attendance was not always voluntary. And it was found impossible to establish a healthy working environment in a military unit because of the rapid turnover of personnel.[51]

Latta and Striefel also noted that

> . . . There is a very real difference in the reception of a proposal for teaching sensitivity to others, personal growth, and self actualization and a proposal for teaching leadership training, understanding the effect of your behavior on troops, counseling people and group decision making. The former is received like . . . [a subversive] speech and the latter a 4th of July speech.[52]

In summary, the officers found these factors which contributed toward successful laboratories: voluntary attendance; endorsement by superiors; attention to administrative matters, such as facilities; use of a linking agent to aid entry into a group and to assist trainers with system and language peculiarities; flexibility in content, length, and hours of laboratories; repeated and detailed

---

[50]Striefel, p. 168. [51]Latta and Striefel, p. 7.

[52]Latta and Striefel, p. 5.

explanations of the laboratory method to prospective participants and their superiors; joint planning by trainers and clients; dealing with participants as equals, and giving them verbal and nonverbal assurances that they are doing well; dealing with needs, goals, and feelings; an environment which minimizes interruptions and aids informality elimination of extra duties for participants; wear of civilian clothing by military personnel; groups no larger than twenty-five; confidentiality; early involvement of the participants; and evaluations by the participants at the end of training, as well as later.[53]

Correctional Training Facility.[54] In early 1969 the cadre and social workers of the Correctional Training Facility at Fort Riley began a laboratory training effort under the guidance of an Army psychologist. The facility was formed of eleven units, each of which provided nine weeks of training and assistance to about 200 military offenders who were to be returned to regular duty if possible, or discharged or confined if necessary. Initially workshops were conducted for units on request of the commander, but it was found that attendance was low and participants frequently left to attend to other duties. In conference with the facility commander, it was decided that

---

[53]Striefel, p. 169.

[54]See also p. 45, this study.

mandatory attendance at workshops would be necessary to meet their objectives. Persons undergoing training included everyone from the unit commander to the cooks, or about twenty men in each unit, and the goals were designed to improve communication and counseling skills, increase understanding of self and the motives of others, and clarify the effective use of rewards and punishment.[55]

The trainers found that the mandatory attendance policy created resistance and negative feelings among laboratory participants. To get beyond the problem quickly, laboratories were begun with small groups discussing feelings about attendance, then reporting to the whole group. This exercise was followed by the small groups forming goals for the training, and another in which actual on-the-job problems were listed for later presentation to the facility commander. Other activities included supervised counseling of trainees, discovering alternative solutions to actual unit problems, and discussions of possible rewards and punishments available in dealing with trainees.[56]

The written evaluations at the end of training brought mostly positive feedback, although it was reported

---

[55]Sebastian Striefel and William Latta, "Human Relations Training with Correctional Staff," unpublished paper, pp. 1-3.

[56]Striefel and Latta, pp. 3-4.

that an average of one negative reaction was expressed in each of the workshops.[57]

Two workshops were conducted for social workers assigned to the Correctional Training Facility to help prepare them to conduct similar workshops on their own. An effort was also made to gain additional support from the facility commander. In order to show his support for the training program he agreed to undergo training with his staff,[58] but the program was canceled before that training occurred.[59]

The School of Command Leadership.[60] The most enduring of the early training efforts at Fort Riley was the School of Command Leadership, which began in July, 1969, and continued until July, 1971, when it was discontinued by action of the trainers.[61] The initial purposes of the school were to develop understanding of self and others, and to increase counseling and communication skills. The format was at first highly structured, but the trainers indicated

---

[57]Striefel and Latta, p. 5.

[58]Striefel and Latta, p. 6.

[59]Latta and others, p. 178.

[60]Also see pp. 44-45, this study.

[61]Raymond L. Parker and Michael Rohrbaugh, "School of Command Leadership--Progress Report and Recommendations for Change in Orientation," Disposition Form ALBFDA-CT, Fort Riley, Kansas, July 7, 1971.

that they were experimenting with becoming less structured. They found, for example, that allowing students to establish their own training goals created better feelings and a willingness to focus on themselves and their behavior--although the goals were essentially the same as those previously established by the trainers.[62]

The experiential approach was maintained throughout the two years of the school, but course content varied, covering management styles, counseling techniques, expressing and dealing with feelings, self-awareness, officer-noncommissioned officer relationships, the changing Army, inter-group competition, drug abuse, and race relations. The five-day course offered by the school was open to officers, noncommissioned officers, and civilian middle managers. All classes were attended in civilian clothing, and only first names were used.[63]

It was reported that about 95 percent of the participants rated the laboratory experience as worthwhile and indicated that they would seek a similar experience if offered during their free time. Superiors reported "an increase in communication on the job," and increased willingness to help others.[64] Comments by participants

---

[62]Striefel, pp. 169-171.

[63]Parker and Rohrbaugh.

[64]Striefel, p. 170.

indicated, however, a desire for training which included senior officers, and the infrequent attendance by an officer above the rank of First Lieutenant was cited by the trainers as one of the problems which led to the discontinuance of the school. Also cited was the fact that participants came from many different post units, thus reducing the impact of the training; participants found no support in their organizations for new behavior. The school requirements on the post were so high that, it appeared to the trainers, only nonessential members of units were assigned to attend--another factor in the closing of the school.[65]

The trainers recommended that in place of the school an organization development program be undertaken on a voluntary basis for "intact command structures of battalion- and company-sized units."[66]

The relationship of the school to higher command on the post was primarily limited to presentation of diplomas and similar formalities. On one occasion, however, command influence was necessary to obtain an adequate number of students from reluctant units, and at another time superiors rejected a proposed name change to "School of Interpersonal Dynamics."[67]

---

[65]Parker and Rohrbaugh.

[66]Parker and Rohrbaugh.

[67]Striefel, p. 170.

About a year following the discontinuance of the School of Command Leadership, the Civilian Personnel Officer and an Army psychologist began another continuing training program, and other programs were conducted as needed with units at Fort Riley. Two of these activities will be reported in detail--a series of five-day sensitivity training laboratories, and a half-day laboratory for the officers and enlisted men of a company experiencing unusual difficulties.

Sensitivity Training

A new series of five-day laboratories sponsored by the Civilian Personnel Office and led by an Army psychologist was begun at Fort Riley in August, 1972. As of March, 1973, seventy-seven persons, including ten active duty military personnel, had been trained in six laboratories, each with about fifteen participants and four trainers.[68]

The goals of the training were stated as: (1) increased insight and awareness concerning one's own behavior, (2) increased sensitivity to the behavior and feelings of others, and (3) transfer of the learning to the job situation. The sessions were titled "Seminar in

---

[68]Michael Rohrbaugh, "Evaluation of CPO Seminar in Interpersonal Relationships," draft paper, Fort Riley, Kansas, March, 1973, p. 1.

Interpersonal Relationships," and were advertised and conducted primarily as sensitivity training.[69] Didactic presentations were kept to a minimum, and most of the week was spent in unstructured small-group meetings, considered by the trainer-psychologist to be the most important part of the program. Instructors were deliberately non-directive, while attempting to model "relevant modes of interaction," such as expressing feelings and offering feedback. Another function of the instructor was to remain alert to psychological processes to ensure that the group experience was not harmful to individuals. When structure was felt necessary, it took such forms as role-playing difficult job situations, sharing first impressions, and analysis of factors affecting job satisfaction.[70]

Participation in the laboratories was intended to be voluntary. Each member was reminded of this before training began, and the initial instructions given to all participants at the beginning of the first session established the rights of any person to leave or to remain and yet maintain privacy. Nevertheless, it was found that some participants were "nominated" and felt obligated to attend. Initial instructions also included the respon-

---

[69]Rohrbaugh, p. 1, and "Seminar in Interpersonal Relationships Course Description," Civilian Personnel Office, Fort Riley, Kansas.

[70]Rohrbaugh, pp. 1-2.

sibility of the individual for his own behavior and the confidential nature of all sessions. During the six laboratories, four persons discontinued training, two because of job requirements, and two on the second day of training because of lack of interest and frustration with the procedures. Rohrbaugh reported that only one participant was known to have required psychiatric help, but that it was several months after attendance. He concluded that the laboratory experience was not indicated as contributory.[71]

Several measurements were made by the trainers to help them evaluate the training. Each participant rated the value of the training to himself as a person, and to himself on the job. The perceived benefit to each member was rated by all other members and the trainers. Each participant was interviewed one to two months after the training to obtain their assessments of the value of training to the individual and to the job. Supervisors and at least one co-worker or subordinate were also asked to estimate whether any on-the-job changes had occurred. Demographic data and attitudes toward the job and organizational environment were collected before training, and daily measures of self-reported anxiety, depression, and hostility were taken during the seminars.[72]

---

[71]Rohrbaugh, pp. 2, 5-6. [72]Rohrbaugh, pp. 2-3.

Although all data has not been collected, and computer analysis is incomplete, the psychologist has offered some preliminary findings. Participants' reports of value to themselves and their jobs indicated greater personal benefit than on-the-job value. Forty-two percent rated the training as 9 (very valuable) on a 9-point scale, and only five percent gave ratings less than five for value to self. The job-related value, although lower, "tended to cluster above the mid-point of the scale." However, job-related value was commonly rated higher in measurements taken one to two months following the training. Eighty percent of the participants indicated that they would voluntarily attend similar training if offered during their off-duty hours. Rohrbaugh found that initially unfavorable reactions to the training tended to moderate or vanish during the week of training. Participants' comments indicated satisfaction with the opportunity to discuss personal and job-related concerns in a relaxed and open atmosphere. Participants indicated new realization that their problems were not unique, developed optimism about their ability to be more tolerant and understanding with others, and gained self-knowledge through feedback from other group members. Bolstered self-confidence was reported in a number of cases.[73]

---

[73]Rohrbaugh, pp. 3-4.

Interviews with persons from the participants' work environments indicated that forty-six percent of the participants had changed on the job, all in favorable directions. The validity of the reports was questioned by the trainer, who estimated that maybe twenty percent had shown "unequivocal, course-related change."[74]

It was reported that participants who rated the course most valuable were not necessarily those who were reported to have made on-the-job changes. Some trends were noted, however. It was found that demographic variables, including military or civilian status, pay grade, and educational level, were unrelated to results. Supervisors tended to rate the seminars more highly than non-supervisors, but the two groups were equally likely to show change in their jobs. Persons who were most satisfied with their jobs (particularly their work and supervision) tended to feel that the training was more valuable than did those who were dissatisfied. Satisfaction with jobs before the training was also related to more changes after the training. Positive change was also found related to the amount of participation (verbal) during training, and with peer ratings of openness. Low levels of anxiety were found correlated with maximum learning, and the psychologist reported that the "incidence of low-gain outcome . . . was higher for . . . non-volunteers . . . ."[75]

---

[74]Rohrbaugh, p. 4. [75]Rohrbaugh, pp. 5-6.

Continuation of the training program was recommended by the psychologist. For an effective program, he made the following recommendations:

> Instructors and group leaders should be experienced in group methods and have a sound background in the dynamics of human behavior and behavior pathology. Training of this nature should be professionally supervised (e.g., by a psychologist, social worker, or psychiatrist), and lines of accountability and responsibility should be clearly defined. . . . The role of course coordinator . . . should be filled by a single individual in the interest of continuity.
>
> Participation should be strictly voluntary. The established method of soliciting participants through the organizational hierarchy . . . maximizes the possibility of employees attending against their wishes and having inaccurate or incomplete information as to the nature and the goals of the program. . . .

It was recommended that a new system of volunteering for participation be instituted, requiring that interested persons personally apply. A final recommendation called for continued screening of all applicants to ensure that they are suited for the training, and screening to continue during and after training for psychological problems.[76]

Superior-Subordinate Confrontation

Rohrbaugh was also involved as consultant and trainer in other areas at Fort Riley. With Libby (a unit chaplain stationed at Fort Riley), he assisted a senior commander who had experienced serious drug and race problems in his organization. With the commander the two officers designed a half-day laboratory for one company. The trainers

---

[76]Rohrbaugh, p. 7.

approached the task with these questions:

1. Can a commander improve or change the attitudes of people toward one another and the unit itself through methods which have been successfully used in non-military organizations?

2. Can the conditions in a small Army unit be changed without coercive or repressive measures, while preserving the integrity and authority of the assigned leaders?[77]

The company selected for training had five officers assigned, four of whom were inexperienced lieutenants. It was short of noncommissioned officers, but overstrength in the lower enlisted ranks. The percentage of blacks in the company was higher than in the other companies of the same battalion, and some of the recent incidents in the company were believed to have been racially motivated. Theft and destruction of both private and government property was high, as was the reputed use of drugs in the barracks.[78]

The objectives established for the training were to (1) bring to the surface and attack specific problems in the unit, (2) facilitate effective communication both vertically and horizontally, and (3) lay the foundation for

---

[77]Billy W. Libby and Michael Rohrbaugh, "Talking it Out," Army, XXII (December, 1972), 39-40. Published also as "A Case Study: Behavioral Science Applications in a Small Army Unit," Social Change, II, No. 3 (1972), 5-6.

[78]Libby and Rohrbaugh, p. 40.

future work in the unit.[79]

The participants included all of the unit officers. They were joined at the chapel for a Saturday morning by eight noncommissioned officers and twenty-two other enlisted men. Although the number of blacks among the enlisted men exceeded their proportion among enlisted men of the entire company, and the number of participants was greater than planned, training continued otherwise as planned.[80]

The purpose of the opening exercise was to get quickly to the problems which interfered with unit communications, and the sources of the conflicts. To accomplish this the participants were divided into their rank groups, and each group was assigned a trainer who used symbols to evoke feelings and reactions. Reactions were recorded on newsprint on the floor, out of sight of members of the other groups, which were meeting in the same large room. The symbols dealt with rank, protest and lifestyle, and religion. After the initial exercise in homogeneous groups, three new groups were formed, each with a mix of ranks and race. The new groups met in small rooms with a trainer to discuss the reactions which had occurred in the opening exercise. After an hour of discussion, all participants met in the large room to hear reports from the mixed-rank groups. This period of feedback ended with

---

[79]Libby and Rohr., p. 40. [80]Libby and Rohr., p. 40.

comments by Rohrbaugh, who emphasized areas where the men could continue useful discussion on their own, particularly in the areas of race relations and conflict among peers at each rank level.[81]

The trainers made suggestions privately to the company commander for improving the atmosphere in the company and the performance of his troops. Suggestions were that discussions be continued in the platoons, including officers and enlisted men, and an outside, neutral person; that leadership classes deal with conflicts over values and life-styles; and that team-building exercises be developed for the company officers.[82]

The trainers reported that during the first exercise, the enlisted group was "lively and vocal." The officers were also actively participating, and one newly commissioned lieutenant identified with responses he heard from the enlisted group. The noncommissioned officers, however, were reserved and seemed to have difficulty relating to the symbols in the presence of their peers. In the mixed-rank groups which followed, conflicts surfaced, participation was high, and confrontations occurred along horizontal and vertical rank lines[83]

---

[81]Libby and Rohrbaugh, p. 40-41.

[82]Libby and Rohrbaugh, pp. 41.

[83]Libby and Rohrbaugh, p. 40-41.

Oral and written evaluations by the participants were "overwhelmingly favorable." However, the trainers conducted no additional laboratories of this type. Because of especially demanding training requirements at the time, the company commander did not continue the training which had begun in the laboratory. The trainers noted, however, that the commander did not "reject the use of behavioral science techniques in his unit."[84]

In striking contrast to this half-day seminar for thirty-five men is the program described in the following section--a program which has involved over one thousand military personnel in laboratory training during the last three years.

CHAPLAIN OD

The Army's chaplains have been described as leaders within the Department of Defense in "making use of modern interpersonal procedures as a means of achieving goals within the organization."[85] Mill has suggested that the best way to present the work in the chaplain branch "intelligibly to others is to describe it as an 'Organization Development' effort."[86] But he has also indicated that the work with the chaplains exceeds what is normally

---

[84]Libby and Rohrbaugh, p. 41.

[85]Mill, "Concept," p. 28. [86]Mill, "Concept," p. 27.

considered organization development,[87] and it is thereby elevated to a position of special significance to the Army as a whole.

Mill described the work of NTL with the chaplains as including work with the system of the chaplain organization, but also as work between systems within the Army and organizations other than the Army, as they are affected by the chaplains. He has called the work "macrosystem organization development," which he defined as

> . . . the use of social science interventions both within and between systems which clarify intersystem perceptions and relationships so that subsequent collaboration will be facilitated.

He further proposed six general principles for macrosystem organization development: (1) The process may begin anywhere in the systems to be affected. The consultant often will not have a choice, or will not be able to identify the "top," where he would like to begin. The readiness at the levels of an organization, and the needs felt by the organization determine the place to begin. "The execution of entry," Mill noted, "is more important than its level or form." (2) Macrosystem diagnosis is an emerging process, rather than a procedure. (3) Advancement must be slow, capitalizing on observed progress and new needs felt by the

---

[87] Cyril R. Mill, "OD in a Macrosystem--A Three-Year Progress Report," a paper read at the NTL Conference on New Technology in Organization Development, Washington, D.C., December 1, 1972, p. 8.

organization. (4) Inside consultants are necessary to keep others working with the organization informed of changes within the organization. (5) Bases of support must be developed horizontally throughout the organization, and vertically above the organization. The latter may involve the development of contacts and friends for later use--a practice Mill recognized as distasteful to some behavioral scientists. (6) Resistance to the process is inevitable. Mill cited four sources of resistance: (a) simple satisfaction with the status quo, and the comfort and security it gives; (b) the assumption that the workshops and activities of the new process are simply "more of the same;" (c) lack of skills necessary for the new processes and roles developed; and (d) fear of failure and reprisal by superiors.[88]

These principles of macrosystem OD may be seen in a survey of the work of Cyril Mill and NTL with the chaplains, and descriptions of laboratory experiences in Germany in 1971 and 1972.

"Execution of Entry"

Mill represented the association of NTL with the chaplain branch in this manner:

> . . . we slipped into it by the side door labelled "race relations training," backed into OD as we saw an opportunity for effecting change in the nature of

---

[88]Mill, "OD," pp. 9-14.

> the Chaplaincy, itself, and are now peering out the front door at the larger systems which make up the Army. Since the chaplains touch many of these systems, perheps we can touch them through the chaplains.[89]

More accurately, however, the entry of NTL into the chaplain program was facilitated by the request of the Secretary of Defense in early 1970 for effective action b all agencies on racial problems. The chaplains consulted with NTL, and together a plan was developed which would meet the request of the Secretary of Defense, but go beyond it as well, to deal with other problems within the branch and the Army. A second factor affecting the scope of the effort undertaken by the branch was a paragraph in the Objectives of the Chief of Chaplains for the 1970's. It stated that the chaplain was expected to "encourage individual and social change within the military community in order that people may more fully express their individual identity, achieve group cohesiveness and be witness to God." Mill noted especially the implications of the words "encourage individual and social change." The chaplain must now become, Mill suggested, "an agent for change for his people and his organization," as well as fill his traditional role as minister to spiritual needs.[90]

A goal agreed to by the Chief of Chaplains and NTL consultants was for chaplains "to re-examine their shared

---

[89]Mill, "OD," p. 14.

[90]Mill, "Concept," pp. 22-23, 25.

assumptions about the norms which govern their behavior with a view toward engaging in a more active, socially conscious ministry in the military community." To effect the change in the chaplains, it was decided that "social technologies" would be required by the chaplains, and that changes in their attitudes toward their work, their view of their role, and their acceptance of the status quo were also necessary. While the internal workings of the chaplain organization were not to be primary targets in the program, it was felt that they would be inevitably affected by new behaviors resulting from new concepts of roles and jobs held by individual chaplains. Also affected would be the views of the chaplain by civilian churches, commanders and the enlisted community. Mill noted, however, that changes in these directions were already in progress when NTL entered the scene, and that the new training efforts only managed and accelerated the change.[91]

The new image desired for the chaplain was of a field-oriented counselor, active in the social ministry, small-group oriented, secular, ecumenical, and a conscience-tickling questioner of the establishment--to replace the more conventional image of a chapel-oriented preacher, interested in Sunday School, big choirs, and big services, religious, and oriented on his denomination and the military

---

[91]Mill, "Concept," p. 24, and "OD," pp. 1-3.

establishment, which he served. Mill indicated that only a small percentage of the chaplains could produce the desired shift within the branch, even two to four percent. But he was "confident that a much higher percentage than this is ready and moving to effect the change we are working for."[92]

Mill outlined six steps for bringing about the social and individual changes in and through the chaplains:

1. An awareness of inequities in the system which inhibit the growth of human potential, and of the chaplains' power to reduce the inequities.

2. The acquisition of skills which will enable the chaplains to aid in the change process.

3. The development of a support system in which senior chaplains understand, accept, and promote the goals of humanization, and encourage juniors to do likewise.

4. A new and acceptable image of chaplains among commanders and enlisted men.

5. The use of "self-rewarding organizational mechanisms" to support the use of new concepts.

6. Modeling of a better organizational system within chaplain offices and the branch, and effective criticism of the systems of which the branch is a part.[93]

---

[92]Mill, "OD," p. 3. [93]Mill, "Concept," p. 24.

Progress

Mill has reported on the first three years of work with the chaplains. During the first year, the objectives of training were the development of better attitudes toward working with racial minorities, new priorities for work, and the redefining of the proper role of the chaplain in the Army. The following activities were carried out to support these objectives:

1. One-hundred career chaplains in school at Fort Hamilton, New York, attended three-day workshops in human relations. Emphasis was placed on attitudes toward blacks and the "protest generation." Some attention was also given to the problem of drug abuse.

2. Similar three-day workshops were conducted at nineteen Army posts in the United States. Each workshop was limited in attendance to twenty-four persons and was tailored to the needs of each post and each group of participants. About five hundred chaplains attended these workshops.

3. Twenty-four chaplains attended NTL's three-week program for training trainers, to develop an in-house capability for group work and consultation.

4. Research was conducted on attitudes of chaplains. (Some of the results will be discussed in a subsequent section of this study.)

5. A conference evaluated the first year of work and

made these recommendations for the second year: more emphasis on self-awareness, four-day laboratories to replace the three-day laboratories, the inclusion of non-chaplains in the program, extension of the program to Army personnel stationed in Germany, the use of chaplains trained in NTL's trainers' course as co-trainers, the establishment of an office within the Office of the Chief of Chaplains for central direction and coordination of the training program, and an expanded research program.[94]

All of the recommendations were implemented in the second year. An officer was selected to undertake eighteen months of graduate work to prepare for duties in the Office of the Chief of Chaplains. By the end of the second year about nine hundred (out of a total chaplain strength of about 1300) had attended NTL-conducted human relations training laboratories. Three-hundred-fifty non-chaplains had also attended under the sponsorship of the chaplains. Mill reported that he began to receive reports indicating a "significant shift in norms regarding the way chaplains were viewing the scope and potential of their role." Some were consulting with officers of other branches on social issues, creating new chapel activities, and using small-group activities in their work with soldiers. Research was conducted to measure the effects of the training on attitudes and values. (The results of research, and the

---

[94]Mill, "OD," pp. 4-5, and "Concept," pp. 25-26.

description of the training conducted in Germany will be discussed in subsequent sections.)[95]

During the third year of the chaplains' training program, greater emphasis was placed on skill training, and higher ranking chaplains were sought for training. Ninety-six chaplains attended regular NTL laboratories and conferences, including Human Interaction Laboratories, Laboratories on Institutional Racism and Higher Education, Management Work Conferences, and Key Executives Conferences. Twenty chaplains entered the Training Theory and Practice Laboratories and the Professional Development Learning Community programs. Newly instituted for chaplains were three-day Learning Utilization Conferences, in which chaplains from the various NTL courses compared their experiences to assist each other in planning for applications of their learnings. Workshops were again conducted in Germany, with a focus on the interface between the chaplain and the commander. Research continued during the third year, with an interest in the effects of military life on attitudes toward self and others. (See subsequent sections of this study for reports on laboratories in Germany and results of research.)[96]

Mill noted that by the end of the third year, the chaplain program was clearly an organization development

---

[95]Mill, "OD," p. 5, and "Concept," pp. 26-27.

[96]Mill, "OD," pp. 6-7, and "Concept," p. 27.

effort and had included a massive training program, the training of inside trainers and consultants, training in management and human relations in civilian courses, inter-group problem solving, new organizational positions and the training and assignment of personnel to fill those positions, and conferences for feedback and recommendations. He also noted that other organization development techniques were available but not widely used by then with the chaplains. These included team building, inter-group problem solving sessions, consultation on a large scale, and data collection and feedback sessions. Also available to the chaplains but not widely used, Mill reported, were several sources of unusual power--the church, the chaplains' position as "representatives of right and justice," their individual personalities, and "the power to limit the extent to which they will accede to the restrictions which bind other branches of the service."[97]

Germany, 1971

In October and November, 1971, three three-day human relations workshops were conducted in Germany for Army personnel stationed there. Both chaplain and non-chaplain personnel were included. The NTL report of the experience emphasized primarily administrative matters which affected the training, with a view toward improvement during a second

---

[97]Mill, "Concept," pp. 24, 28-29.

series of laboratories, scheduled for 1972.[98]

In the report, Mill noted that the program had received a favorable response from participants. On a 9-point scale, with 1 representing unsatisfactory and 9 representing excellent, fifty-four percent of the participants had given a final evaluation of 8 or 9. Eighty-six percent were on the favorable end of the scale, and only seven percent were on the unfavorable end. Written comments indicated a desire for longer workshops and a broader representation, to include both line officers and enlisted men. They also expressed appreciation for new insights and increased awareness of feelings and self.[99]

The administrative problems cited by Mill included the inappropriateness of shared facilities in clubs and hotel rooms, and the difficulty experienced in obtaining easels and newsprint for laboratory exercises. "Our general impression," the report continued, "was that the administration of this program was a last-minute, pick-up, and emergency affair." Project officers had been reassigned and replaced at the last moment, and "there was great uncertainty as to who was going to attend the programs." The report mentioned a shortage of black participants and recommended that at least one-third blacks

---

[98]"Human Relations Training for Chaplains, USAREUR and 7th Army," December 12, 1971, p. 1.

[99]"USAREUR and 7th Army," p. 1.

attend the 1972 laboratories, as well as enlisted men and non-chaplain officers. Voluntary attendance was considered important, but the NTL report indicated that most of those who had attended had not done so voluntarily. High ranking officers were not in attendance, and the report claimed that due to a belief that the attendance of high ranking officers would be disruptive, they had been discouraged from attending. Repeat attendees were recommended for 1972, as well as the use of night sessions to avoid the long break from the afternoon sessions to the following morning's sessions.[100]

Another problem with the first effort in Germany was interruptions of training. Business telephone calls were received by participants. Project officers or their assistants interrupted with administrative problems such as filling out transportation forms. Visitors and observers attended some groups without participating. In one session the project officer and a sergeant sat through all of the meetings, the sergeant occasionally commenting without actually entering the group. In another group the wife of one of the members attended a meeting.[101]

The NTL staff altered the training design at each location, each time increasing the time devoted to small-

---

[100] "USAREUR and 7th Army," pp. 1-3,5.

[101] "USAREUR and 7th Army," pp. 4-5.

group meetings. Mill indicated that it was in the small groups that chaplains achieved the greatest learnings about self and emotions and became most engaged in a "rich interchange." Nonverbal techniques were rarely used because of the trainers' experiences with chaplains, which had indicated that such techniques were not well received. Drug addiction was a topic not well received by the chaplains, but race relations did receive their support. Mill noted that greater attention to the role of the chaplain would be necessary in future laboratories because of the confusion expressed over the new emphasis on social issues, which some considered a threat to their primary calling to preach and minister in the spiritual realm. Mill also observed that non-chaplains in the groups were more supporting of others, were in touch with the attitudes of troops, gave appreciative comments more readily, and were not "hung up on philosophy."[102]

For this first effort with troops in Germany, Mill noted, the NTL staff had approached the experience with the attitude that the laboratories would be enjoyable, important, involving but not social, and that changes would occur. It seemed to the trainers that on the other hand, the "top command" in Germany assumed that the effort was to be a traditional conference--a chore, unenjoyable, something to

---

[102]"USAREUR and 7th Army," pp. 5-6.

be avoided or handled and forgotten, and that nothing much good would come of it. The Army's Commander-in-Chief in Europe spoke at another conference held elsewhere in Germany on the same topic as the NTL laboratories, and that received extensive press coverage. (Some participants from that conference reported, however, according to Mill, "disappointment in the quality of the speeches, the emptiness of words, and the futility of talking about such peripheral topics as 'How can we get more black wives into wives' groups?'")[103]

The NTL staff made three recommendations to the Chief of Chaplains, based on their experience in Germany: that a study be made to determine the attitudes and behaviors appropriate to the new chaplain image being sought, that volunteers for the chaplaincy be selected to fit the new standards, and that chaplains in the Army be screened to determine which meet the standards so that they can be encouraged and rewarded.[104]

The experience in Germany and the report made to the Chief of Chaplains also brought into the open strong resistance to the new concepts and techniques. A copy of the NTL report from the files in Europe was annotated with the comments "ridiculous" and "brain washing." The report also resulted in a letter from the command chaplain in Europe

---

[103]"USAREUR and 7th Army," p. 3.

[104]"USAREUR and 7th Army," p. 7.

to Mill, with a copy to the Chief of Chaplains. The letter recommended that the planned NTL laboratories in Germany in 1972 be canceled, because "we feel nothing would be gained in expending government funds for another series" of sessions. In the letter, the chaplain accused the NTL trainers of an inability to adjust to the European environment, "absurd" comments on the administration of the program, failure to understand the necessity for formalities such as military orders, and other "bald" and "baseless" statements.[105]

The NTL team did return to Germany in 1972, however, and the new command chaplain was active in the design of the training laboratories.

Germany, 1972

The 1972 series of NTL laboratories in Germany were designed by the command chaplain and executed by the NTL trainers. Each laboratory was designed for a mix of participants--about one-third chaplains, one-third other officers, and one-third noncommissioned officers. Nine laboratories were conducted, with an average attendance of about twenty-four. The first of the laboratories was for "officers of higher rank."[106]

---

[105]Letter from the Command Chaplain, United States Army Europe, to Cyril R. Mill, May 11, 1972.

[106]"Report to the Chief of Chaplains re: Training in USAREUR, October-November, 1972, pp. 1, 3, and Mill, Pastors', p. 7.

The objective of the laboratories was to enable the three groups of participants "to discuss with one another their work, their frustrations, and to give group-level feedback." The trainers found that the chaplains learned about how they "came over" to the others, and the others learned about the role of the chaplain and gained insights on how to more effectively work with the chaplains. During the training occasional secondary interests arose, such as race relations and the new Army. Although each of the laboratories was tailored to specific needs of the participants, a representative description of the training has been recorded, and is given in full in Appendix B.[107]

The trainers evaluated the first of the laboratories as the least successful. Twenty-seven of the participants in the senior officers' workshop returned final evaluation forms, fourteen of which were positive, one neutral, and nine negative. Three participants did not complete the evaluation form. Two of the negative ratings were from chaplains who had attended at least three laboratories previously, and they felt they had reached the point of diminishing returns. Others indicated disappointment because the workshop had not dealt with race problems. The trainers also attributed the negative climate to "two of the chaplains [who] seemed to be working out some of their private problems

---

[107] "Report to the Chief," pp. 5-6.

in their reactions to the training and the staff."[108]

No reports of interference were included from the 1972 laboratories. However it was reported that at one location a brigadier general "had shown a great interest in the training program" and "visited the workshop twice to observe its progress. It was not suggested that the visits were disruptive, as had been the experience in 1971.[109]

One of the trainers analyzed the final ratings of the participants in one of the workshops. It was found that the average rating was 8.1 on a scale of 9, where high numbers indicated high satisfaction. In comparing the scores of those who criticised the sessions on some point--seven persons were in this group--with those who made no criticism (thirteen members), it was found that "criticisms had no effect on participants' overall assessment of the workshop." It was found, however, that other factors (lack of information about the laboratory before attendance, and poor facilities) did lower satisfaction ratings.[110]

The report listed a number of learnings and implications resulting from the training: (1) Participants were able to establish better priorities after viewing their jobs as they in fact were in the garrison environment.

---

[108] "Report to the Chief," p. 3.

[109] "Report to the Chief," p. 4.

[110] "Report to the Chief," pp. 4-5.

(2) Denominationalism was a strong force. Although chaplains generally worked well together, real ecumenism was given only "lip service." (3) Chaplains were frequently guilty of unethical behavior, as in public criticism of other chaplains. (4) Counseling skills and understanding of counseling ethics were poor. (5) The chaplains' officer status was seen as a barrier in much of their work with others, and to effective relationships among chaplains. And (6) the training of the chaplain appeared repetitious and haphazard, with a lack of alternate courses for a career in the chaplaincy.[111]

The after action report of one of the project officers for three of the laboratories lends another dimension to the problems and results of the training effort. A major problem reported in the 3d Infantry Division was confusion about the objectives of training. The United States Army, Europe, letter which announced the training to the division indicated that the workshops were to improve the counseling skills of the participants. The topics of the workshops were listed as human relations in the services, interpersonal and intergroup problem solving techniques, the development of cross-cultural understanding for minority groups, young adult authoritarian attitudes, and the improvement of communication skills. The NTL team,

---

[111] "Report to the Chief," pp. 1-2, 7-10.

however, listed as their goals: look at communications, work on team building, look at competitive relationships, and dynamics of chaplains and non-chaplains. "In essence," the report continued, "the purpose of the workshops was to examine the feelings of the chaplains and non-chaplains in attendance to share ideas on how to better work as a team to assist the military community." Time was wasted, it was reported, clarifying the differently stated goals, which had confused some of the participants.[112]

In the division and from supporting units, seventy-nine persons attended the three laboratories, fifteen of them chaplains. This was lower participation by the chaplains than was called for in the basic design. The evaluation by the division's participants was positive. More workshops were thought desirable, because they dealt usefully with concrete problems. But it was also felt that senior officers should attend such workshops also.[113]

Indications From Research and Training Experiences

From experience in the laboratories in Germany and elsewhere, and from several research projects, the NTL program director and a chaplain have begun to develop in-

---

[112] "After Action Report on the National Training Laboratory Human Relations Workshops," Disposition Form AETSBCH, 3d Infantry Division, November 27, 1972.

[113] "After Action."

dications and assumptions about the chaplain, the effects of an Army career upon him, and the proper functions for and results of their laboratory training and organization development efforts.

Early in the chaplain program a research project was conducted by an Army chaplain. Wright attempted to assess the effects of a three-day laboratory on the attitudes of twenty-two chaplains. Measured were their acceptance of others, tolerance, and judgments of others. All of the chaplains had expressed an interest in attending the laboratory, were assigned to the same military installation, were volunteers for the chaplaincy, Vietnam veterans, and most had had no previous experience with sensitivity training groups. The laboratory was described as having

> . . . a focus on self-awareness and interpersonal relations--with a special emphasis on the relationship of a person's feelings to . . . three problem areas . . . , racism, drug addiction, and changing life-styles of youth.

The first half-day of the laboratory was used for becoming acquainted and relaxed. Through small-group and nonverbal activities the participants were to become "more in touch with their own bodies and feelings." The remainder of the three days was spent in two T-groups of eleven members each. These were interrupted occasionally for exercises and short theory sessions.[114]

---

[114]Wendell T. Wright, "A Training Program for Army Chaplains in Human Relations and Applied Behavioral Science," Military Chaplains' Review, II (January, 1973), 33-34.

The Least Preferred Co-worker Scale was selected to measure the changes in attitudes. The test, measuring such qualities as pleasant-unpleasant, friendly-unfriendly, and accepting-rejecting, was administered ten days before the laboratory began, and again at the conclusion. The investigator had hypothesized that chaplains subjected to training would show greater acceptance of others, tolerance, and leniency in evaluating others. The results of the testing were not statistically significant, however. The average for twenty-two participants who took the pre-test was 60.95, and the average for nineteen who took the post-test was 61.05. Wright concluded that chaplains tend to be person-oriented, and that growth "may be indicated by little change: sometimes . . . in the direction of task orientation, as indicated by a decrease in their LPC scores." He added that

> Ministers as a group generally have difficulty facing interpersonal conflict and using it creatively; often they have been taught to suppress or deny anger and conflict as being evil. One of the objectives of the human relations lab is to improve honest and open interpersonal communication--including real feelings that exist between people. It may be that as a result of the lab experience some people develop the ability more adequately to face their own and other people's hostility and anger. A "successful" lab, therefore, might conceivably show no change or even a decrease in LPC scores.

Noting that defensiveness appeared to be strong among the chaplains throughout the laboratory, Wright added that

> . . . there seems to be some factor inherent in the early training of a clergyman or his subsequent experience that tends to make him be a very cognitive,

> verbal person. In spite of this, however, there seemed to be some progress made toward the integration of feeling and thought, and the awareness of one's total being.[115]

Wright also noted a similarity between the results he obtained on attitude change and the results obtained by Mill in an NTL study of forty-eight chaplains in two laboratories. Mill found no significant change in the group average on the dogmatism scale as a result of training. Significant individual change was noted, however, and the conclusion was made that each person changed according to his own choice and needs. The Mill study continued:

> . . . chaplains represent a cross-section of the American public as far as prejudice is concerned, and . . . the challenge for NTL lay in seeing what their training techniques do to reduce this prejudice on an individual basis, whenever the man seemed ready to change.[116]

Mill reported that the dogmatism scale was used early in the chaplain program to help NTL trainers adjust to laboratory participants unlike most who attended other NTL laboratories. He told the chaplains:

> . . . During that first year and somewhat into the second, it seemed that chaplains ranked among the most hostile groups we had ever tried to work with. The hostility was shown in many ways such as in excessive passivity, extraordinary dependence, in resistance to the training design, in negative expressions of attitudes and feelings, in not hearing or misinterpreting our statements, and in frontal attacks (only verbal, of course) on the trainers, the design, and the training program as a whole.

Suspecting that the hostility might be a response to the

---

[115]Wright, pp. 33-37. [116]Wright, p. 35.

"hippie dress and language of some of the trainers," the heavy emphasis on racial attitudes, or the intrusion of civilians and laymen into the world of the military chaplain, the trainers administered the dogmatism scale to selected groups. They found that the chaplains scored "above average for middle management in the U. S." "This is not to say," Mill told the chaplains, "that chaplains are without prejudicial attitudes, or even that they are low. Middle management America is a fairly rigid stratum of society. It is not," he continued, " . . . a company that chaplains would want to keep."[117]

Another measurement made with the chaplains concerned the effects of a chaplaincy career on the chaplain's self-concept. At Fort Hamilton, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale was administered to two groups: seventy-five men entering the service and attending the Chaplain Basic Officers Course, and ninety-six officers with six to eight years of service and attending the Chaplain Career Officers Course. The instrument contained one hundred self-descriptive items with which the participant was to portray himself. Mill described the self-concept as encompassing one's feelings of competency and worth, and "highly influential in much of his behavior and also directly related to his general personality and state of mental health."[118]

---

[117]Mill, Pastors', p. 2. [118]Mill, Pastors' p. 3.

The results from the students were processed by computer, and a report was obtained from the author of the test, Mill reported.

> . . . He examined the scores for two evidences of difference between the groups, i.e. averages on various parts of the scale and variability or the extent to which a group contains members who give extreme scores. Well adjusted groups score in the desirable direction on most scales and also show fewer extreme deviations from the average.
>
> There was little difference in the average scores of the two groups. Both groups on the whole were quite normal; they were generally well adjusted in comparison to the general population. Their self concepts were internally consistent and less variable than most adults. This was partly due to the fact that both groups tended to present themselves in a good light; they sought to present a positive picture of themselves. They knew what was socially acceptable and reached to conform to that image. Their self esteem was above average.
>
> The Advanced Group was significantly more open and self-critical than the Basic Group, almost to a fault. The Basic Group was more typically defended, as in the general population.
>
> It was when we examined the extreme scores that we found that the groups differed. The Career Class contained more individuals who obtained extremely high or low scores. To a statistically significant degree the Advanced Group displayed more variability on 11 out of a possible 32 measures. These included such measures as a general tendency to disagree (contrariness), measures of self-esteem, identity, self satisfaction, own behavior, physical and moral self and personal, family and social self. Thus we concluded that where the Basic Class gave responses which clustered together, the Advanced Class was more heterogeneous, possibly showing a tendency to be more extreme either by self-castigation or by showing overwhelming self satisfaction.

Mill acknowledged that the data could not reveal the cause of the differences between the two groups in the self concept, a question he was interested in pursuing, perhaps through a longitudinal study. He suggested that the senior

chaplains

> . . . may have been different all along, due to changing times, differences in selection, different patterns of church affiliation or what not. Or, the groups may have been equal initially, but the Advanced Group may have changed as a result of aging, increased rank, or because of their experiences in the service.[119]

Mill's writings contain a variety of other implications useful in this study. Social activism and ecumenism have received some attention earlier in this study. Additionally, on social activism, Mill suggested that the chaplain who has restricted his ministry to spiritual needs can be helped "so that his presence will be consequential in human affairs as well as in the spiritual life of his community."[120] On ecumenism, Mill has likened chaplains' feelings to dynamite, and has suggested that religious beliefs observed by some chaplains have been an inappropriate bar to an effective ministry.[121]

Mill has emphasized the use of power when necessary to assist in the task of altering the nature of the chaplaincy. He wrote:

> . . . The Chief of Chaplains has supported this program from the beginning and has continually provided assistance when requested. We have learned to make sparing use of his power--wide recognition of its existence and potential has usually been all that was necessary. The change program is seen as his program . . . .

Although he supports the concept of voluntary attendance,

---

[119]Mill, Pastors', pp. 3-4.

[120]Mill, "Concept," p. 23. [121]Mill, Pastors', pp.6,9.

Mill has concluded that

> . . . As soon as you enter an organization to work on the inside . . . , implicit coercion becomes unavoidable. Persons in positions of power decide that the OD program will go into effect and, willy nilly, others must go along.[122]

Rewards have been mentioned previously in this portion of the study. Mill anticipated that the Chief of Chaplains would increasingly reward those who "worked toward the development of human potential and social justice in the military community" and noted that

> . . . wide publicity is given to the fact that certain chaplains who took risks are being promoted or given interesting job assignments.[123]

Nevertheless, Mill reported that "a few" have chosen to "sit aside for the three or four days of the workshops," and he indicated both some personal discomfort over the ethical issue of invading the privacy of laboratory participants, and a suspicion that some who would have preferred to "sit aside" have participated under subtle pressures.[124]

In the NTL report on the first series of laboratories in Germany, it was stated that chaplains are mild-mannered "figures" requiring conversion into "action-oriented community builders." They were further characterized as self centered, idealistic, highly competitive, lone

---

[122]Mill, "OD," pp. 11-12. [123]Mill, "OD," pp. 4, 14.

[124]Mill, "OD," p. 13.

wolves, and especially poor in team relationships.[125]

Mill has also addressed the issue of the qualifications of the trainer. As has been noted earlier, the training of inside trainers and consultants within the chaplain branch has been going on for several years. Mill indicated the importance of sound training:

> . . . typical training to the doctoral level in clinical psychology, psychiatry, education, or administration, does not prepare one to utilize laboratory training techniques. One of the distressing features of this new profession is the increasing numbers of persons who, on the basis of attendance at a laboratory, are incautious enough to attempt to conduct their own groups on the laboratory model.

In a proposal to the Chief of Chaplains, NTL then described the need for chaplains trained properly in laboratory techniques, and the NTL program for supplying that proper training.[126]

A New Phase

A recent letter from Department of the Army reveals a new effort of the chaplains in their continuing and expanding program. The letter announced that at ten major installations in the United States the Chief of Chaplains will sponsor a program of chaplain organization development. The program is designed

---

[125] "USAREUR and 7th Army," pp. 6-7.

[126] "A Proposal for the Training of Army Base Chaplains in Human Relations and Applied Behavioral Science," The NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, Washington, D.C., May 7, 1970, pp. 6-9.

> . . . to assist the post commander and his Post Chaplain to develop a more effective chaplain organization on the installation, to determine the spiritual, morale and welfare program needs of the military community, and to design/conduct chaplain activity programs which meet the needs of the many cultural backgrounds and life styles of soldiers and/or their dependents.

The letter also announced that from each post chaplains were to attend NTL programs, specifically, Management Work Conference, Training Theory and Practice Lab, Human Interaction/Community Labs, and Program for Specialists in OD. Following the training, the chaplains were to plan, develop, and execute a responsive program at each installation. To assist them, each was to receive on-sight technical assistance.[127]

Two of the ten installations announced for post chaplain OD efforts are Fort Riley and Fort Ord. Several Fort Riley laboratories have already been described in this study; some involved chaplains, but the efforts were largely those of the psychologists stationed at Fort Riley. Fort Ord has also used its psychologist resources in some of its training efforts, and an Army test program of OD is currently in progress at the post, although it does not include the chaplains' new effort there. The work at Fort Ord will be described in the next section.

---

[127] "Chaplain Organization Development," letter DAAG-ASM DACH-PPZ-B to the Commander, Continental Army Command, March 16, 1973.

OD EVALUATION--FORT ORD

Fort Ord, California, has seen a number of behavioral science applications since July, 1969. Some of the early objectives were simply the improvement in qualifications and performance of instructors, trainers, and supervisors; development of policies and procedures to improve motivation and morale among trainees; reduction of the impact of extra duties and special programs which interfered with normal activities; and convenient hours of operation of post facilities for those who lived and worked on the installation. A number of improvements were recorded, including statistical measurements of morale and attitude, establishment of advisory councils, and others.[128] The basic training experiment with rewards and punishment, previously cited, was one of the major behavioral science studies at Fort Ord.

In late 1971 the Commanding General at Fort Ord directed that a study be made of the possibilities for establishing awareness training for the post's field grade officers. Such training was begun in January, 1972, in five-day programs which included not only field grade officers, but equivalently ranked civilians as well. More than two hundred attended the sessions. The main thrusts of the

---

[128] OD Plan, Fort Ord, California, reproduced copy from the Office of the Chief of Staff, United States Army, pp. A-2-1 to A-2-3.

training were self-awareness, group problem-solving, increased awareness of hidden goals and motivations, and nonverbal communication. It was felt that better counseling abilities, improved communication, and greater self-confidence resulted from the training. The Commanding General considered the awareness training a success.[129]

OD Plan and Objectives

Based on the awareness training program, an organization development program was planned, intended to create better organizational communications and flexibility, and more personal motivation and job satisfaction. By mid-1972 Department of the Army had directed that the OD work at Fort Ord become a two-year pilot project, and in September the OD Directorate was established, responsible for both the execution and evaluation of an OD program. The overall objective of the project was "to determine whether or not OD is an efficient and effective process to help build a better Army." Included in the objective were four requirements:

1. Define staffing requirements to conduct OD activities at Army installations.

2. Refine OD techniques and procedures for the Army.

3. Measure the effects of OD on the functioning of standard Army organizations.

---

[129]Plan, pp. A-2-3 to A-2-4, A-2-6.

4. Develop proposals and instructional materials for incorporation of training in OD techniques into the Army educational systems for officers and noncommissioned officers.

Nineteen persons (four officers, seven enlisted men, and eight civilians) were approved for assignment to the OD Directorate, including two Army psychologists.[130]

The plan for the pilot project called for four phases. During the first phase (from January to June, 1973), "identification, refinement, and development of the OD process and evaluation system" were to be undertaken in experiences with small organizations. During the same period the directorate staff was to participate in the Fort Ord Leadership and Professionalism School, conduct a post-wide educational program on OD, including an orientation for senior officers, and "execute a series of OD related training sessions." The second phase was to run for the last half of 1973. The procedures and evaluation system were to be tested on larger and more complex organizations. Other activities from the first phase were to be continued in Phase II, as well as the completion of the design and testing of the evaluation system.[131]

---

[130]Plan, pp. 2-3, A-2-8 to A-2-9, A-3-1 with two attached pages.

[131]Plan, p. 4.

Phase III was to run through all of 1974. Fort Ord organizations were to receive organization development assistance, and evaluations were to be made to determine staffing requirements and effects of OD. Training literature was to be developed during this phase. The final phase was to run for the first half of 1975 with an OD operation at another installation to allow an evaluation of the processes and system developed during the two years at Fort Ord.[132]

Techniques

The techniques for OD at Fort Ord were described as:

Senior Officers Orientation. This program was designed to allow officers to study their own communications, job satisfaction, and effectiveness; provide techniques for analysis of communication and decision-making processes; encourage the clarification of goals, sub-goals, and alternatives to achieve the goals; and to obtain information to assist in structuring of other OD efforts. The orientation was to be presented twice, running for three days and two evenings each time, and at a location physically separated from job locations and facilitating interaction. A list of goals for the orientations was to be obtained from interviews with the officers to attend and the Commanding General prior to the meetings. These goals were to become topics for group work by the senior officers.[133]

---

[132]Plan, pp. 4-5. [133]Plan, pp. C-1 to C-2.

OD Related Training. This training was designed to deal with increased awareness, improved community involvement, or innovative approaches to problem solving. Work was to be done with members of a variety of organizations, or with members of a single organization, specializing in a specific problem. The focus of the experiential training was described as the individual in relation to his own self awareness, communication patterns, or creativity. Four types of OD related training were included in the plan: Awareness Training, Communication Training, Creativity Programs in Innovative Problem Solving, and Community Programs. Awareness Training, described as one of the "building blocks of organizational interaction" and therefore a valuable tool in the improvement of organizational effectiveness, was designed to increase empathy, perceptivity, and awareness of self and others. At Fort Ord, courses were designed to last two-and-one-half days for eight to fourteen group members. Normal duty uniforms were to be worn, although the atmosphere was intended to be relaxed and informal. The trainer was to give specific instructions at the beginning of the first day, and they included reminders to be open and honest, informal, and active, to give and receive feedback, to deal with feelings, and to maintain confidentiality. These instructions were to be followed by a review of the laboratory goals, and a series of group activities. The detailed opening instructions and the goals and methods of the group activities are con-

tained in Appendix C.[134]

Communication Training, planned for use with individuals and groups to improve communications within groups and in all directions to other groups, was to assist persons in an understanding of the complexities and various components of communication and how to apply them effectively. The three-day laboratories were aimed at improving listening, understanding, and communication skills. Listening triads were to emphasize clear communication and the abilities to listen, understand, and correctly summarize. Active listening was to be a second exercise. In it declarative sentences were to be responded to by other group members, who were to state how the speaker felt about the subject of the declaration. Verbal Progression was to be an exercise to help distinguish between thoughts and feelings, to link feelings to observable behavior, and to practice empathy. In small groups, members were to describe nonverbal behavior which they saw, later what they thought about what they saw, what they felt about what they saw, and what they thought another felt. Communication Training was to end with a discussion of the experience, and the critique by group members.[135]

Creativity Programs in Innovative Training were to

---

[134]Plan, pp. D-1-1 to D-1-3.

[135]Plan, pp. D-2-1 to D-2-6.

involve ten to thirty participants in one- to two-day experiences to increase the quantity and quality of ideas and methods of studying and solving problems. The training was to begin with the sharing of ideas on creativity. Exercises were to follow, such as the creation of inappropriate nicknames for members of the group, generation of a list of goals and problems for use later in the group, study of the "myriad alternatives" available in problem solving, brainstorming, creation of group pictures, fantasy exercises, consideration of the creative implications of risk-taking, and consideration of creative solutions to actual job-related problems.[136]

The fourth form of OD related training, Community Programs, was to have a focus on the solution of community-centered problems. Groups were to be composed of large numbers of persons or representatives from separate groups within the community. Laboratories were to last from one to four days. A typical approach to community problems was described as one organization requesting the attendance of other groups or their representatives for a problem-oriented discussion. The meeting would be conducted by the leader of the initiating organization, with the intent of collecting "unbiased relevant knowledge, facts, and ideas." Information would be posted on large posters as it was generated.[137]

---

[136]Plan, pp. D-3-1 to D-3-4.

[137]Plan, pp. D-4-1 to D-4-3.

Team Building. A major element of the OD program at Fort Ord was identified as Team Building. It was described as a long-range effort to provide the commander or manager with procedures for assessing and upgrading job satisfaction, communication, and effectiveness within the organization through training of the organization members who work together daily. Lengths of team building programs may vary from one day to five days and nights, but the five-day programs were considered to be adequate at Fort Ord. Teams to be trained were to have from two to ten members, depending on job functions, areas of special knowledge, and the nature of vertical and horizontal communications. The development of mature interpersonal relationships was to be stressed throughout the process, which also was to seek to change patterns of relationships between people and groups to permit more effective problem solving and increased efficiency. The training was to have five stages--as Blake and Mouton (The Managerial Grid, 1964) conceived of it. Briefly stated, the stages begin with the development of an understanding of organization development and efficiency. This is followed by the application of principles in actual group work, then in work with other groups with which the group being trained is naturally associated. The fourth stage is aimed at the formation of team development goals, and the final stage establishes action groups within the organization to carry out the improvement goals, commonly

done with the assistance of a consultant.[138]

Plan for Evaluation

A series of instruments were designed or planned for development to evaluate the OD effort at Fort Ord. Initial testing was to be aimed at measuring the satisfaction of personnel assigned to the post, and of their dependents. Later retests were to indicate changes in satisfaction, some of which might be attributable to the OD effort. Organizations selected for OD were to be informed of the evaluation process--how information was to be collected, that anonymity was assured, and how the results were to be used. All members of the organization were to be tested. The analysis of questionnaires was to lead to interviews, then to a focus on problems identified by the organization members, and the determination of measures which could be used to assess the effectiveness of the organization in these areas, based on information maintained by the organization. A similar procedure was to be followed with organizations related to the one under study, to determine how they viewed the efficiency and effectiveness of that organization. The OD staff may also observe certain operations, and monitor actions and policy changes made during the OD operation. Surveys administered two to four weeks after the organization development operation were to be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the operation and the perceived reasons for the

---

[138]Plan, pp. E-1 to E-8.

changes. Three to six months later a similar procedure was to be followed. The follow-up measurements were also intended to help the OD staff to determine whether they should conduct another OD operation with the organization, continue to monitor the results of the original operation, or totally disengage from the organization.[139]

It was intended that both the subjective evaluations of organizations which had undergone OD operations, and the use of an experimental design to statistically suggest the effects of OD would be used in this effort to devise methods for improving the Army.[140]

Unlike the series of laboratories at Fort Riley, the project at Fort Ord (as well as the chaplains' program) has been large-scale, centrally-directed, and well-funded. (The budget for the OD Directorate has been estimated at about $250,000 each year for three years.[141]) The two cases which follow represent small, local laboratory experiences, lacking the continuity of the Fort Riley experiences, and the size, central direction, and funding of the two OD programs. One proposes the use of Army personnel to aid the "marginal soldier" through group training in small Army units. The other employed a consulting firm to conduct a weekend laboratory for senior staff officers.

---

[139]Plan, pp. F-1 to F-4. [140]Plan, p. F-5.

[141]Plan, pp. 2, A-4-1.

ISOLATED CASES

Senior Staff Officers[142]

In the fall of 1972, a New York firm was employed to conduct laboratory training for fourteen senior staff officers from one of the Army's headquarters in the United States. The officers had indicated an interest in improving their abilities to communicate. Conducted at a "retreat" away from the military environment, activities for the Friday noon to Sunday noon program ranged from the initial introduction, explanation of the laboratory technique, and development of workshop aims, to a variety of group activities such as the NASA Exercise and role-playing.

The officers approached the laboratory with apprehension, having agreed to the training only when assured that it would not involve any unacceptable "sensitivity exercises of the 'feely-touchy' sort." Although recognizing their need for improved communication skills, they came to the laboratory with few ideas for improving themselves on the job or in their homes. These two problems--apprehension and lack of direction--occupied the first afternoon of the laboratory. Instruction in the latent as well as manifest aspects of communication, and reassurance as to the nature of the training were the main

---

[142]Anonymous.

efforts during that afternoon.

In the exercises which followed on Saturday and Sunday, the participants found on two occasions that the exercises were too demanding, and the direction of the laboratory was changed. The first objection came during role-playing and "tell-me-what-I'm saying" exercises, which were discontinued because of the high degree of self-revelation involved. One observer reported that "many of the group accurately described the impossibility of total exposure in a hierarchical structure in which one's entire career is at stake." The second occasion came during the NASA Exercise, where it was found that the officers brought their normal military roles to the exercise. They became anxious because peers, they felt, were coming to know them too well. Because of this, the workshop again was turned in "a more didactic-rationalist direction."

It was reported that various members of the training group expressed gratification for the training, buzz groups "turned out a surprising number of practical suggestions" concerning the conduct of staff meetings at the headquarters, and that "the possibility of better horizontal communication within one staff was affirmed." The learning was theoretical, didactic, rationalistic, and concerned concrete, real-life personal and job-related concerns.

Marginal Soldiers

A final variation of laboratory training to be considered in this study has been described by an Army chaplain and proposed for use in small Army units. Called a Personal Insight Discovery Group, the laboratory is intended to aid soldiers who are at least temporarily good enough to remain in their units, but who exhibit frustration, hostility, defensiveness, destructive behavior, and feelings of low worth: the "marginal soldier." Because medical assistance may often be unavailable or inappropriate, the marginal soldier has often been merely reassigned, or allowed to develop into a case for other administrative or disciplinary action. In such cases the problems for the military units involved were only partially solved, and new problems were created for the soldier.[143]

Reed has proposed that units may effectively undertake creative solutions for their own marginal soldiers. From an initial attempt to use the Personal Insight Discovery Group in an air defense battalion stationed in Germany in the summer of 1972, he has developed several principles for effective use of the groups:

1. Although commanders may nominate marginal soldiers for group work, actual attendance should result from an

---

[143]John H. Reed, "Personal Insight Discovery Group: A Pilot Project for Army Battalion and/or Battery Size Units," an unpublished paper, pp. 1-3.

agreement between the group leader and the individual after the development of rapport and a counseling relationship. (Reed experienced difficulty with non-volunteers in his first attempt. To him it seemed that

> . . . the leader was the only person who had positive values and a strong ego and was willing to reveal his strengths and positive values. The leader stood alone against a group of negatively oriented people . . .

--that his assistance was seen as irrelevant, manipulative, and propaganda.)

2. Marginal soldiers should contract for two hours of group work each week for four weeks. Contracts should be renewable if evaluation by the trainer indicates possible additional value to the soldier and his unit.

3. Leaders from commanders to squad leaders must be adequately informed about and supportive of the program. Sensitivity to the needs of the marginal soldier and an understanding of the group processes may well be developed in encounter groups for these leaders.

4. The leader should be experienced in group counseling, and ideally would be a member of the unit from which participants come. Two co-counselors should be selected from each local unit by the leader. Their positive attitudes, the respect of the marginal soldiers, and the open identification of their role in the group would reinforce the position of the leader and model open, effective behavior.

5. Group composition must be flexible from week to week. New members will join the group as they enter into contracts,

and others will leave to try out their new insights without direct group support. The rapid turn-over of personnel in many units also dictates flexibility.

6. The group leader must work with commanders to develop incentives for new behavior for each of the active members.

7. Groups should meet away from military units in a neutral setting (although this created problems in the first series of laboratories because not all commanders and other leaders were intent on supporting the effort, and transportation was not always made available, especially for marginal soldiers).

8. The style of the laboratory should be determined largely by the capabilities and preferences of the leader, and may vary from the encounter group to the largely educational group, highly structured and with an emphasis on learning content.[144]

SUMMARY

The behavioral sciences have long been of value in efforts to improve the Army, despite "evidence" to the contrary--stereotypes of rigidity, conformity and callousness, and problems and complaints of inefficiency and neglect of human values. Such stereotypes and complaints have often been based on factual characteristics of the Army

---

[144]Reed, pp. 3-4, 12-17.

and military personnel, and have stemmed in part from the necessities of combat and accumulated traditions. But other forces, often overlooked, have also been at work in the Army, intended to improve human relationships, reduce authoritarianism, increase competency and efficiency of Army personnel and their organizations. A relatively recent application of the behavioral sciences has been laboratory training. In 1968 and 1969 Army psychologists and social workers were involved at a number of installations where they were stationed and others for which they served as consultants. They described their work as experimental and developmental. Fort Riley, Kansas, was the scene of several early laboratories and has seen continuous use of laboratories to the present. Sensitivity training in a continuing five-day course, laboratories for intact units, and a school in humanistic leadership have been among the wide variety of applications at that post.

Army chaplains have also been extensively involved in laboratory training, especially since 1970, when T-groups became a primary tool in their race relations training. Laboratories were then, and have continued to be, largely conducted by NTL, but the focus of training has shifted to organization development, involving basic changes in concepts of the chaplaincy and the relationships with other Army systems. Laboratories conducted with mixtures of chaplains, non-chaplain officers, and enlisted men have been conducted

throughout the United States and Germany. Extensive use of established NTL laboratories and the establishment of consultative relationships with individual chaplains or chaplain activities have also been major features of the chaplain OD program. Social activism and ecumenism have been increasingly stressed in material prepared by the NTL project director.

Simultaneously, organization development has come under study by the Department of the Army in a program at Fort Ord, California. Stemming from successful "awareness training" for officers and civilians at the post in 1972, a large-scale program with entire organizations was planned, then integrated with Department of the Army plans to investigate laboratory techniques and their value for improving the Army. The OD Directorate, under the Commanding General of Fort Ord, has planned a two-year program which includes the use of awareness, creativity, communication, and community training, team building, and the collection and evaluation of objective data. Begun in 1973, the project is scheduled for completion at Fort Ord by the end of 1974, and a trial application at a second Army post is scheduled for 1975 if OD is found in fact useful for Army organizations.

Other applications of laboratory training have occurred in relatively small and isolated cases. Typical of such cases are the employment of an outside consultant to conduct a weekend of training for senior staff officers

at one Army post, and a trial program conducted by a chaplain to improve the lot of the "marginal soldier" and his value to his organization.

A number of issues have been raised repeatedly by trainers and participants in Army laboratories. In some cases there has been almost total agreement. In other cases wide differences in philosophies, techniques, and other factors have been apparent. The following chapter will view selected aspects of laboratory training and the implications of the cases of training which have been reported in this chapter.

Chapter 3

A REVIEW OF CHARACTERISTICS OF ARMY LABORATORIES

The cases and programs of laboratory training which have been reported in the preceding chapter may be helpfully reviewed for their impact in selected areas. In some areas all trainers agreed on principles, techniques, or other factors which contribute toward effective training; and in other areas several positions were represented. The areas which will be considered in this chapter were selected because they were addressed in many or all of the cases reported, or were associated with notably successful or difficult training. Subjects will be considered under five headings: (1) Role of Commanders and Senior Officers; (2) Qualifications and Role of Trainers; (3) Facilities and Formalities; (4) Other Matters of Design--including the frequency and length of sessions, duration of training, objectives, content and types of laboratories, group size, the populations from which participants were drawn, conditions of attendance, and the relationship of the training effort to broader or ongoing programs; and (5) Results--including objective and subjective evaluations by trainers, participants, and others, and the effects of individual training efforts on the status of laboratory training in the Army.

ROLE OF COMMANDERS AND SENIOR OFFICERS

Commanders and senior officers have been involved with laboratory training in several ways: planning and establishing policies, supporting, and direct participation in groups. Latta and others reported conducting laboratories in 1968 and 1969 in response to specific requests and to meet specific needs expressed by commanders. A mandatory attendance policy was established by the commander of the Correctional Training Facility after consultation with the trainers. Libby and Rohrbaugh designed a half-day laboratory for volunteers from a company in consultation with a senior commander. Mill reported that the second series of NTL laboratories in Germany were broadly designed by the Army's command chaplain in Europe. It was reported that at Fort Ord it was the Commanding General who directed a study of the possibilities for awareness training. The study led to the use of laboratories with officers and civilians in 1972, and eventually to a large-scale organization development test program. Under the OD plan, organizations will be surveyed extensively, and members of the organizations interviewed to determine the needs of the organizations and of their members.

In other cases, where the planning was done largely or exclusively by trainers, the support of commanders was considered essential. Mill advocated the cultivation of contacts with sources of power so that their influence

could be used when necessary. The Chief of Chaplains was recognized as such a source of power by Mill, and throughout the chaplain branch. Another source of power was the civilian churches. Reed noted the importance of authorities in assuring proper support for training, and Latta and others observed that the higher the authority, the better the support and greater the acceptance of the training and results. Reed also indicated the need for a close relationship between the trainer and the commander to insure an effective nomination and selection procedure for participants, attendance of those under contract with the trainer, and incentives to encourage new behavior. In its early stages, the School of Command Leadership at Fort Riley required the support of the commander to obtain a sufficient number of students from reluctant units. Mill frequently cited the use of rewards as an important part of the chaplains' OD program. Promotions and good assignments were among effective rewards.

In a number of cases "linking agents" and inside consultants were used, although it is not clear that these agents were always representatives of the commander. Latta and others considered such agents necessary for effective work in the unit, both by outside trainers, and continuing after the departure of trainers. They experienced some trouble with agents who were not qualified or not interested in the continuation of training without outside help. Libby

and Rohrbaugh, working with a unit with no linking agent, found that although the commander did not reject the laboratory method of training for himself and members of his company training was not continued. Local agents or co-trainers were common in NTL laboratories within the chaplains' program. In Reed's concept, peer agents from participants' units served as co-trainers to assist in trainer credibility and to model effective behavior with highly hostile groups.

Support from commanders was indicated in some cases by response to the effects of training. At Fort Ord, awareness training laboratories concluded with visits from the commander or supervisor, who received reports from the groups on job-related problems which had been discussed as part of the group training. The Chief of Chaplains supported organization development, rewarding those who changed in the desired directions, and supporting a second series of laboratories in Germany after receiving a recommendation from the command chaplain in Europe that the second series be canceled. It was suggested that changes were made at an Army headquarters based on suggestions from fourteen staff officers who attended a weekend laboratory.

Other commanders have shown support for laboratory training by actual participation. From an early experience at Fort Riley it was reported that a commander was required to attend a laboratory he had requested in order to make a

more efficient unit. A company commander and all of his officers attended a short laboratory with volunteers from his noncommissioned officers and other enlisted men. Also at Fort Riley, the commander of the Correctional Training Facility agreed to receive laboratory training with his staff to show his support for a training program which had been restricted to subordinate units--although the training was discontinued before the training with the commander occurred. In the subordinate units, however, commanders had been required to attend with all members of their units. Senior staff officers attended a weekend of training conducted by an outside consulting firm, and at Fort Ord senior officers were to receive three days of training, or orientation, under the plan for organization development. An NTL laboratory for senior officers was the first of the series of laboratories in Germany in 1972. Some dissatisfaction has been expressed with the laboratories for senior officers, however. Mill reported that the senior officers' laboratory in Germany was the least successful of the nine laboratories. He also reported after the first year in Germany that there had been a deliberate avoidance of participation by senior officers because it had been assumed that their attendance would have been disruptive. Participants and trainers at the Fort Riley School of Command Leadership noted that seniors would both benefit from the training and be a help to others who attended, but that the

attendance of a person in a key position or above the rank of even First Lieutenant was rare. Participants in the 3d Infantry Division in Germany expressed a similar desire for seniors to participate. The laboratory for fourteen senior staff officers encountered some difficulties because the participants were not prepared to engage in typical laboratory exercises. Reed recommended the use of the encounter group to help create an understanding and supportive climate among commanders and other leaders for the training of marginal soldiers.

QUALIFICATIONS AND ROLE OF TRAINERS

Many of the reported cases of laboratory training have included the training of trainers. In some cases the linking agents, discussed in the preceding section, were intended to become trainers in their own right, or to serve as co-trainers. The chaplain program included the training of trainers from its inception. Established NTL laboratories have been the major source of such training for chaplains.

The early laboratories at Fort Riley were almost exclusively the work of psychologists from the post's mental hygiene clinic. They and others experimented with laboratory techniques in 1968 and 1969 and established a set of principles which they passed on to other psychologists at a convention in December, 1969. Also at the convention a

two-day laboratory was conducted for the psychologists. A major objective was to expose the professionals to many of the established laboratory techniques and to encourage the use of laboratory training by the officers. And Rohrbaugh recommended that trainers for sensitivity training at Fort Riley have experience in group work and a background in human behavior and behavior pathology--psychologists, social workers, and psychiatrists. He further suggested that clear lines of accountability be established for all trainers. Latta and others reported the training of certain persons to become trainers in their organizations, but in most cases it involved the training of persons they considered otherwise qualified for such work, by virtue of their training and experience in the areas of mental health. Such were the cases at the disciplinary barracks at Fort Leavenworth and the Medical Field Service Schools.

Mill, on the other hand, warned that training, even advanced training in psychology and psychiatry, or a number of other disciplines, does not qualify a person as a trainer. Nor was attendance at a previous laboratory sufficient training, according to Mill. He recommended the use of NTL training programs for the development of an in-house training capability for the chaplain branch.

Many of the reported cases were highly structured laboratories, and the function of the trainer was to direct the course of events. In some, however, the role

was to model effective behavior. In these cases trainers would also interrupt occasionally with short theory sessions or group exercises. Rohrbaugh added that the trainer was also to observe participants for any signs of psychological problems. He also saw a responsibility of the trainer to interview and select from among volunteers those who would be suitable for training, and to continue to monitor the results of training for some time after the laboratory. Reed also suggested the need for trainer involvement before the beginning of the actual laboratory. In his design, the purpose of early involvement was to establish rapport with prospective participants.

FACILITIES AND FORMALITIES

Concern with proper facilities, scheduling, and equipment for training was evident in most of the reported cases. From the early Fort Riley experiences it was concluded that comfortable and isolated facilities assisted in the laboratory process. Rohrbaugh used the service club, and Libby and Rohrbaugh used chapel facilities. At Fort Ord an isolated post facility was used for the Senior Officers Orientation to encourage interaction and avoid job-related interferences. Mill found that sharing rooms with other activities in military clubs in Germany was not acceptable, and some of the chapel facilities used were too small. He conceded, however, that hotel rooms could be

used for small-group work, but that a large room in the same building would also be required for larger group work. Latta and others found that a single, large room could be arranged for their five small groups and large group meetings with a minimum of interference and inconvenience, even for forty-two participants. Reed recommended the use of "neutral" facilities, involving the removal of participants from air defense batteries in Germany, but increasing the requirements for support, such as transportation. Libby and Rohrbaugh reported a possible benefit from a trio of small groups meeting in a single room. Useful responses of members of one group to the action in another group were reported.

Despite efforts to isolate participants from their normal activities, interruptions were reported in many cases. Rohrbaugh reported that two of seventy-seven participants left a five-day course to attend to their jobs. From a variety of experiences at Fort Riley it was reported that job distractions caused absences as well as interruptions. This led to the mandatory training policy at the Correctional Training Facility. "Moonlighting" and extra duties were found to distract from the training. Libby and Rohrbaugh conducted a half-day laboratory on Saturday, reducing the likelihood of interruptions, and an anonymously reported laboratory for staff officers was similarly scheduled--from Friday noon to Sunday noon--and was additionally

held at a retreat some distance from the post. Mill reported the attendance of a participant's wife at one meeting of a group in Germany, and some groups had military observers at all sessions, as well as interruptions for administrative matters such as filling out forms for transportation. In the second year of training in Germany the visits of an interested general officer were apparently not found to be disruptive, although the general was not an actual participant.

In one instance mention was made of the difficulty of conducting laboratory training without certain traditional equipment. Mill reported to the chaplains that the second series of NTL laboratories in Germany would have to be more carefully planned and executed by the chaplains to ensure that easels and newsprint were available at all sites scheduled for training.

A wide variety ofapproaches were used in handling traditional military formalities, such as rank, uniforms, and manner of address between seniors and subordinates. At the Command Leadership School, it was reported, first names only were used, although attendance was by officers, enlisted men, and civilians. The same practice was followed for psychologists at their convention, although they were all officers, encouraged by the wear of name tags with first names only. At the Command Leadership School all classes were attended in civilian clothes, and the psychologists removed uniform

blouses with their rank and decorations. But at Fort Ord, participants in awareness training were to attend in their normal duty uniforms.

OTHER MATTERS OF DESIGN

Latta and others concluded from their early experiences with laboratory training that a few days set aside for training were better than a few hours for successive weeks. Their laboratories commonly ran for two to five days, and included such variations as five successive afternoons, and a marathon. NTL laboratories for chaplains began as three-day events, but were extended to four days after the first year. However, their laboratories in Germany in 1971 were three-day laboratories, and the NTL report recommended the use of evenings, which had been free time, for a more potent training program. But in 1972, although evenings were used, the length of the laboratories was trimmed to two days. The Command Leadership School and the Seminar in Interpersonal Relationships, both at Fort Riley, were five-day courses. Other laboratories typically fell within this general pattern--two days for senior staff officers, for example, and two-and-one-half and three-day laboratories for awareness training and Senior Officers Orientation at Fort Ord. As an exception to the pattern, Reed recommended meeting two hours each week for four weeks. Mill suggested after the 1971 series of laboratories in

Germany that repeat attenders should be encouraged, despite the fact that a number of chaplains had indicated in their end-of-training evaluations that they had reached a point of diminishing returns, having already attended a few similar laboratories. And at Fort Ord, a large variety of laboratories, with varying objectives indicates that persons will be exposed to repeated laboratory experiences.

Fort Riley's early trainers stressed the need to remain flexible in course content. Latta, Morrison, and Striefel; Mill; Reed; Libby and Rohrbaugh; and the OD plan for Fort Ord--all have mentioned and illustrated the flexibility required by each group and each organization from which the groups were drawn. Rohrbaugh's five-day laboratories varied in content as the trainers sensed the progress of the groups. Latta and others found it necessary for trainers to meet during breaks and in the evening to redesign the second day of their laboratory for psychologists because of unusual developments on the first day. Mill indicated that each laboratory conducted by NTL for the chaplains varied from post to post and group to group. In Germany, Mill reported that as a series progressed, less nonverbal activities were included and more time was devoted to small-group work, because experience indicated that these changes created more effective laboratories. Although each laboratory had its own reason for existence, goals remained similar from laboratory to laboratory. Typical goals

were the improvement of communication and counseling skills, awareness or sensitivity to self and others, changes in self-concepts and concept of role, and changes in attitudes and behavior toward self, others, and the organization. Psychologists reported local goals including increased sensitivity of hospital personnel for patients, innovative treatment for correctional facility trainees, humanistic approaches to the reduction of serious race and drug problems, better instructor-student relations, and more efficient military units. Mill reported a shift in emphasis in the chaplain program from issues such as race relations to issues such as self-concept and the proper role of the chaplain--although race relations and other social issues remain elements of many of the laboratories. "A better Army" has been indicated as the ultimate goal of the OD project at Fort Ord.

The five-day laboratories begun at Fort Riley in 1972 and presently continuing are openly titled sensitivity training and acknowledge the use of the T-group for the major portion of the week. A number of the early laboratories at Fort Riley and elsewhere were also clearly forms of sensitivity training. When the School of Command Leadership was discontinued, Parker and Rohrbaugh, although not rejecting the use of the T-group for the purpose, recommended a shift in the thrust of training at Fort Riley, from efforts with groups collected from a large number of

different units, to organization development efforts with intact units. The early laboratories conducted by NTL with Army chaplains were T-groups, but with the shift in the chaplain program to organization development, the use of T-groups has become less frequent. It appears, however, that many of the laboratories, while not strictly T-groups, do contain many T-group properties. The awareness training conducted at Fort Ord, and planned for use in the organization development test there, also appears to contain T-group properties, although highly structured, as are most experiences planned for use there. Latta and others found psychologists inclined to seek the T-group experience in a laboratory intended to be highly cognitive, and a large number of structured exercises were injected to reduce the T-group atmosphere. Reed recommended a range of formats, depending primarily on the capabilities and preferences of the trainer. He felt that most styles of laboratories, from encounter groups to educational experiences, could be employed in dealing with the marginal soldier. He did, however, suggest the use of the encounter group for gaining support and understanding for problem members of Army units and the group training program. Senior staff officers rejected the use of standard exercises commonly associated with sensitivity training, and indicated a preference for strictly job-related discussion. One of the staff officers suggested that sensitivity exercises were too revealing and

a threat to an officer's career.

Mill described most recent laboratories with the chaplains as employing group-level feedback. Most of the laboratories proposed for use at Fort Ord also avoid the intensity of personal risk and involvement commonly associated with sensitivity training, although creativity training, awareness training, communication training, and community training may include some elements also found in less structured and personal growth training.

Again, general agreement was apparent among the trainers cited in this study on group size. Awareness training at Fort Ord was designed for eight to fourteen-member groups. In Germany NTL groups averaged twenty-four members. Most reported laboratories were within this size range. Libby and Rohrbaugh conducted training with thirty-five persons in a short laboratory--more than they had requested and planned for. Latta and others used five trainers for a group of forty-two psychologists, and concluded that one agent could reach up to fifty persons, but that groups no larger than twenty-five were more desirable.

Groups drew their members from numerous sources. Some were homogeneous, such as all-chaplain, all-senior officer, all-marginal soldier, and all-psychologist groups. Others were mixed groups. NTL trained chaplains, non-chaplain officers, and enlisted men together; officers and equivalently ranked civilians were trained together at Fort

Ord; officers, enlisted men, and civilians attended the Fort Riley School of Command Leadership and more recent laboratories together; and other cases reported mixtures of supervisors with their subordinates, instructors with their students, and similar mixtures. But in all cases, trainers endorsed the concept of voluntary training. Latta and other officers at Fort Riley did seek and receive an order from the Correctional Training Facility Commander making attendance at laboratories mandatory, but the training program there was never completed. They found that mandatory attendance created a high level of hostility among participants, and that required resolution before training was able to continue effectively. In one other case attendance was clearly required; trainers required the attendance of a commander at laboratories he had requested for his unit. Trainers found, however, that even in voluntary laboratories there would also be non-volunteers. Mill claimed that a majority of the chaplains who attended the laboratories in Germany in 1971 were not volunteers--an allegation denied by the command chaplain. Rohrbaugh interviewed all prospective participants to insure voluntary attendance, but found, nevertheless that some had been assigned to attend and remained out of a sense of obligation. Rohrbaugh's analysis of data collected during his experience with training at Fort Riley revealed

that non-volunteers tended to benefit less from the training than others. The effects of inadequate advance information was indicated as a source of involuntary attendance. Senior staff officers "agreed" to attend a weekend of training but found themselves refusing certain elements of the training offered, training which apparently exceeded the implied contract under which they had volunteered. Latta and others stressed the need for repeated explanations of the laboratory method before the beginning of actual training.

In many of the reported cases, it was not indicated whether the voluntary attendance principle was observed. However, Fort Ord awareness training began with instructions from the trainer which included a reminder that any participant was free to leave if he could not accept or cope with the experience. At Fort Riley similar initial instructions were given to participants in sensitivity training. There it was reported that two persons (almost three percent of participants in the six laboratories) departed on the second day of training out of frustration with the course of events. Similarly, Mill mentioned that some chaplains exercised their right to "sit aside" during laboratories, although he suspected others participated despite a desire not to do so. In organization development, Mill suggested, inevitable implicit coercion will exist, although attempts should be made to minimize it. At Fort Ord, organizations

to undergo organization development were to volunteer for the training.

Trainers also sought to keep a stable group composition during a laboratory, involving a commitment of rarely more than five days from the participants. Reed, however, accepted an "open" group, with membership constantly changing as contracts were entered or expired, and because of normal personnel turbulence.

Many of the training efforts have been isolated from broader programs. No tie to other programs were evident in most of the work at Fort Riley, although some were successful, and one, the Command Leadership School, continued in operation for two years. No laboratory work followed the half-day laboratory for members of a company. The Personal Insight Discovery Group proposed by Reed has been largely an individual effort of a single Army chaplain. Most of the early laboratories at Fort Riley were, however, extensions of the services of the mental health clinic, and may still be considered in that light. On the other hand, the Fort Ord organization development effort grew from awareness training, which itself was an extension of earlier efforts in applying the behavioral sciences. In another sense, the chaplain training program may be considered as a part of a larger movement. Mill reported that the current training effort with NTL only serves to manage and accelerate changes which were already in progress when they

came on the scene.

RESULTS

Some results of training have been mentioned in earlier sections of this chapter--including the final evaluations by participants, which have been typically highly favorable. Those evaluations also tended to indicate a desire for participation by seniors, and in laboratories including seniors that seniors were the least satisfied with the training. Also mentioned were indications that satisfaction with training was affected by administrative matters more than satisfaction with the content or manner of conduct of workshops, that mandatory attendance created high levels of hostility and reduced the level of learning.

In his work with a T-group, Wright found that the attitudes of twenty-two Army chaplains were not altered by the training, and he indicated that the results were similar to a lack of consistent change in dogmatism among chaplains in a study conducted by Mill. Mill reported that chaplains ranked high in dogmatism, and also found that experienced chaplains showed more extreme scores in self-concept than did newly-commissioned chaplains. Extreme deviations were thought to indicate poorly adjusted groups, but the causes of the differences were not known. Rohrbaugh used a variety of instruments and found that a five-day

sensitivity training laboratory resulted in estimates of personal value by participants and a lower estimate of on-the-job value. The latter value was increased by participants as time passed, however. Estimates by persons associated with participants were frequently that changes had occurred as a result of training, and in favorable directions. Rohrbaugh considered such estimates inflated, however, and himself estimated that twenty percent showed job-related improvements in behavior. Through objective measurements, Rohrbaugh found that volunteers for training, persons with high verbal participation, low levels of anxiety during training, and persons who entered training with high levels of job satisfaction were associated with high benefit from training, but that most demographic factors had little effect on outcomes. Satisfaction with training was found to be highest among supervisors and persons satisfied with their jobs.

Rohrbaugh was the only trainer to report the possibility of psychological harm to a participant. In the one case of which he was aware, however, he considered it only remotely possible that sensitivity training was connected to the later requirement of one participant for psychiatric care.

Training experiences had effects also on the status of laboratories and programs among individuals and organizations. The progression from successful awareness

training to organization development at Fort Ord has already been noted. The laboratory for psychologists at their 1969 convention was believed to have led to the establishment of several laboratory training programs by participants, and the attendance of some at NTL laboratories. Rohrbaugh found that negative feelings about training were frequently altered as training progressed. But in the anonymously reported instance of training for staff officers, the initial concern of the officers about the nature of training appeared also during the training and led to the rejection of two training exercises. No final evaluation of the officers was reported. The NTL program with the chaplains has survived a number of negative reactions; the reported high levels of hostility toward trainers and training even into the second year, a recommendation for cancellation of a series of laboratories in Germany by the command chaplain, and frequent reports of a surfeit of laboratories for many of the participants.

SUMMARY

In short, then, the consensus of the trainers represented in this study was that attendance at laboratories should be strictly voluntary, although all recognized the difficulty or impossibility of attaining the goal. The greatest effort to ensure voluntary attendance was for the comparitively long sensitivity training program at Fort

Riley. More highly structured groups, and those dealing with less personal issues showed less stringent efforts to ensure voluntary attendance. A variety of laboratory training forms were used. The T-group was used at Fort Riley in 1972 and 1973 for five-day laboratories, and by Wright and NTL trainers in early work with the chaplains. Mill sought group-level feedback in later laboratories, and laboratories planned for use at Fort Ord had varied objectives and forms, from personal creativity to team building.

A major difference was apparent in the training of trainers. Latta and others, and Rohrbaugh indicated a need for trainers skilled in social work, psychology or psychiatry, plus a basic knowledge of the common tools and techniques of laboratory training. Early training at Fort Riley often included the objective of training others within their own organizations to carry on training without outside assistance, after relatively brief exposure to the training experience. Mill suggested that the NTL trainers' course was desirable for chaplains who aspired to be trainers, and that doctoral training in psychology or other disciplines, or attendance at laboratories was insufficient preparation for training leadership. Another major difference appeared in the place of the commander in the training activities. Some directed, planned, and supported training; some participated with their subordinates; others attended separate training for seniors; and some abstained from

participation under the assumption that their attendance would be disruptive. The wear of civilian clothing and use of first names was practiced in some laboratories, but in others the uniform was worn and other formalities observed.

General agreement was apparent on length, scheduling, and size of laboratories. Most laboratories were from two to four days in length, although some were as short as one-half day, and others as long as five days. Although some were larger, most laboratories were attended by less than twenty-five persons, and many were in the range of about eight to fifteen. In only one case was it preferred to conduct training a few hours each week for several weeks. In all other cases consecutive training days were preferred, and in some cases night sessions were included to increase the impact of the training experience.

The reported cases of training have had mixed results. Some programs were suspended before completion of training. Others resulted in expanded programs. The effects on participants and organizations has also varied. Some research has indicated no change in attitudes, while subjective evaluations by participants and trainers have frequently suggested personal and job-related benefits.

The following chapter will consider the agreements and disagreements, the results and lack of results, and offer observations concerning the Army's experience with laboratory training.

Chapter 4

AN EVALUATION

One general officer reportedly replied in writing to a description of laboratory training activities on his post: "Ugh."[1] A more precise analysis and evaluation, however, would be useful in determining laboratory training's effects, problems, and potential in the Army. It is the purpose of this chapter, therefore, to offer critiques of specific facets of the Army's involvement in laboratory training. In the process reference will be made to characteristics and problems of training which were surveyed in Chapter 1, and to instances of training described in Chapter 2.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives stated for Army laboratories were generally of the type Gibb found most common in the literature (increased sensitivity, functional attitudes toward self and others, interdependent behavior, and management of feelings and motivations), and the commonly stated objectives of organization development (such as trust among individuals and groups; individual self-control, self-direction, and sense of "ownership" of organization objectives; increased collaboration; and greater reliance upon knowledge and

---

[1] Anonymous.

competence). However, in the chaplain organization development program is a unique objective which may well fall beyond the ethical and efficacious limits of laboratory training: the conversion of chaplains into ecumenical social activists. That perspectives on social problems and ecumenism are religious issues is clear from this statement of a Presbyterian elder and professor of history at Catawba College:

> Today in the contemporary church modern paganism may well be invading Christian thought and practice in much the same way as its ancient counterpart infiltrated the early Church. The ecumenical movement stands in relation to Christian orthodoxy today in many respects as cultured paganism in its Greek trappings stood to the Church of the first four centuries. This movement represents a kind of synthesis between Christian and non-Christian thought.
>
> The ecumenical attack on the pure Gospel is much more dangerous because it is more subtle. Although some who are active in the movement would openly sacrifice the supernaturalism of the Gospel in the interests of religious inclusiveness, they are in the minority.
>
> The great majority would prefer a blend of Christian and humanistic elements with a synergistic conception of redemption, exalting the value of human effort.[2]

It appears, then, that chaplains are being requested through organization development and laboratory training to endorse selected religious doctrines. In addition actions have been taken or recommended to ensure support for the selected doctrines. These actions include the definition of the ideal chaplain, selection of those volunteers for the chaplaincy who most nearly conform to the new image, and encouragement and rewards for those already in the chaplaincy who best

---

[2] C. Gregg Singer, "A Cultural Intrusion," The Presbyterian Journal, XXXII (May 30, 1973), 1, 7.

exhibit the desired attitudes and behaviors.

Wright and Mill have reported numerous indications of resistance to training and lack of changes from training efforts--despite the tendency for participants to rate the training they have received highly. Mill mentioned that some chaplains had declined to participate in laboratories they attended; Wright reported no change in attitudes of chaplains in his study of the effects of a T-group, and no change in the high level of dogmatism in Mill's study; Mill reported that trainers sensed an unusually intense hostility in chaplain groups for more than a year; and in several cases chaplains were reported dissatisfied with a surfeit of laboratories. That these results have been caused by excessive demands for change is not clear. But it is proposed that directed change, such as is implied in the chaplain program, is beyond the powers of the laboratory method, and will result in increased negative effects.

The chaplain OD program also merits scrutiny by other segments of the Army. It would be well for the Army to determine what is implied in the counsel offered by Mill to not "accede to the restrictions which bind" others in the Army, and his proposal to alter the Army through the effort which originated as a race-relations training program with the chaplains in 1970. While the Army needs to be altered and seeks ways to become more effective, it might well ask what Mill proposes to make of the Army--what images and

doctrines are proposed.

RESEARCH

Research in Army applications of laboratory training has been inadequate. Generally control groups were not used. In most cases trainers in effect evaluated themselves. The latter weakness appears particularly inappropriate for the OD evaluation at Fort Ord. There the OD Directorate has been charged with responsibilty for both conducting and evaluating OD. The OD Plan appears to announce the value of OD in the Army and outline a plan to prove it. Although the stated purpose of the effort is to determine whether or not OD is suitable for Army use, one may be reasonably certain that it will be found useful. (The plan also calls for the use of a careful research design. Its use and the publication of results would be a valuable exception to the present trend in both research and publicity.) In the chaplains' program, research has been recommended and carried out each year. In some instances the research was designed to simply acquaint the trainers with the persons with whom they were dealing. But in other cases the research has been a matter of self-evaluation. The obvious commitment of both NTL and the Chief of Chaplains to the massive program makes it unlikely that either could evaluate the program and its effects with total objectivity.

In no case has the research performed in the two OD

programs or by Rohrbaugh shown that the objectives stated for the training efforts were achieved--that chaplains embraced a new concept of themselves and their role, that behavior changes occurred on the job after T-group training at Fort Riley, or that awareness training at Fort Ord increased participant empathy, for example. Most trainers have relied heavily on final evaluations of training by participants, and such evaluations have inevitably been highly complimentary. They cannot, however, adequately measure changes in attitudes and behavior, although they remain valuable for modeling effective behavior, gaining support, and improving subsequent training. Mill noted that administrative matters were major determinants of such ratings, and Rohrbaugh found that participant change was equally likely (or unlikely) among the various levels of satisfaction with training.

The seeming lack of interest in careful investigation of Army laboratories could be explained by a presumption that the objectives may be met in military groups in the same degree as they are met in other groups. But such a presumption may not be justified. Mill found that chaplains scored considerably higher in dogmatism than most groups with which the NTL trainers had experience. Rohrbaugh found low levels of anxiety associated with learning in T-groups, while an assumption Campbell and Dunnette found common in T-group literature was that anxiety aids learning. But even if military laboratories could

correctly be likened to civilian laboratories, the results in civilian laboratories have been ambiguous in many cases. Gibb called the results of investigations generally "controversial and open to legitimate multiple interpretations." Campbell and Dunnette found little evidence to support changes in self-perceptions resulting from T-groups. Similar caution has been expressed for other aspects of laboratory training results. On the other hand, some results of laboratory training have been well documented. Cooper and Mangham, for instance, indicated that wide agreement exists among observers that T-groups create more tolerance and consideration, and clearer communication, among other changes. The results of research in this field, then, indefinite as they are in many cases, and the possibility that differences between some or all military laboratories and others suggest a need for research which has clearly not been met.

OTHER ASPECTS OF TRAINING

A number of problems have been raised directly by trainers for Army laboratories, and by participants. Areas of agreement and differences have been indicated in earlier chapters of this study, and it is not intended that they be repeated here. There are, however, other observations which appear justified by the reported instances of training.

Populations

Laboratories have been conducted with a large variety of participants and mixtures of participants. There have been some indications of similarity between participants from different sources within the Army--such as civilian and military personnel in Rohrbaugh's laboratories. And in other cases differences have been noted--as in NTL workshops, where chaplains were found to be less effective in groups than non-chaplains, and in training by Libby and Rohrbaugh, where noncommissioned officers were described as more inhibited in group activities with their peers than were junior enlisted men or officers. The scope of experiences suggests a healthy, aggressive approach to training, and perhaps surprising willingness of persons and organizations to experiment and seek improvement. Possibly, however, the stereotyping of populations (most notable in the writings of Wright and Mill) ignores significant differences within populations. In the case of the chaplains, many generalizations by Mill and Wright appear to be largely subjective explanations for the absence of effects from training and to stress the need for training.

The treatment accorded senior officers at Fort Ord, and in other instances, suggests that seniors, unlike their subordinates, are already, do not need to be, cannot become, or can become on their own aware, sensitive, and creative--suppositions belied by research with battalion commanders

and brigadier general designees. The training of senior officers in isolation appears to have merit, but the reported instances of training indicate that commanders and others in authority can also safely and usefully train with their subordinates. (The participation and support of senior officers at Fort Ord does appear to be a valuable part of the OD program, superior to the neglect by senior officers in the 1971 NTL laboratories in Germany, and in some of the training at Fort Riley.)

Centralized Control

Some degree of central planning and execution of sensitivity training and OD seem reasonable. In one sense, the chaplain branch program may be considered an extremely centralized operation. Resistance to training by the command chaplain in Europe was overruled in the Pentagon. Objectives and prescriptions for personal development have been shaped in Washington. And rewards emanate from the office of the Chief of Chaplains. In another sense, however, the chaplain branch has conducted OD without what would seem to be justified control by the Department of the Army. For instance, while research into the techniques and effects of OD has only begun at Fort Ord, the chaplains, entering their fourth year of extensive laboratory training and OD, have undertaken OD programs at ten installations--including Fort Ord. Another installation listed for chaplain OD was Fort Riley, where psychologists have been active in

laboratory training since 1968, including training for chaplains, and with the assistance of individual chaplains. That the efforts will be coordinated or integrated is not clear.

Several other problems and questions suggest themselves: What will be the next step if OD is found effective by the OD Directorate? Are the dichotemous philosophies of chaplains and psychologists compatible? Is control over local programs necessary because of possible undesirable psychological effects, or to prevent the loss of the individual which Coulson predicted? What system can effectively develop Army people and organizations in the face of the inevitable and continuous loss of trained personnel, skilled and committed trainers, and commanders who support laboratory training? How important is voluntary attendance in the brief and highly structured laboratories most common in the Army? Is clearly required participation less damaging than reliance upon unspoken demands for participation?

The answers to these and many other questions which can be asked must be determined primarily through research. The limited extent and mixed quality of research at the present, the incomplete and withheld records of training and research, and the relatively recent entry of laboratory training into the Army environment require only tentative conclusions. These are offered, with a summary of the study in the following chapter.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was designed to examine the possibilities for the use of laboratory training in the Army through the description and analysis of a variety of training experiences. A brief survey of the theories and peculiar qualities, problems, and results of laboratory training are contained in Chapter 1, and they serve to define sensitivity training and organization development for this study. The former term was defined as a form of small-group training for "normal" persons, studying actual experiences in the group, dealing with emotions and their effects on communication, and employing feedback--with a focus on personal and interpersonal deficiencies and potentialities. Organization development was defined as a process which may include the use of sensitivity training, and intended to develop competent, committed, self-responsible, and fully-functioning individuals and "active, viable, vital organizations." Although research has not been conclusive in many cases, training has been indicated as useful in these areas. But the effects of training have been found to include in some cases psychological damage--a problem which must be considered. Other problems noted in the opening chapter included the selection of participants, and

the conduct of voluntary laboratories. The image of laboratory training has suffered from certain stereotypes in popular use, and may be an obstacle to the use of such training. It was also suggested that for some organizations the objectives and effects of laboratory training may not be acceptable.

Chapter 2 makes note of some common stereotypes of the military, such as rigidity, conformity, and callousness, and problems and complaints against the military for seeming inefficiency and neglect of human values. Such stereotypes and complaints were found to have some factual basis. But other forces have been at work in the Army, intended to improve human relationships, reduce authoritarianism, and increase competency and efficiency of Army personnel and their organizations. One attempt in this direction has been the use of laboratory training. In 1968 and 1969 Army psychologists and social workers were involved at a number of installations where they were stationed and others for which they served as consultants. They described their work as experimental and developmental. Fort Riley, Kansas, was the location of several early laboratories and has seen continuous use of laboratories to the present. Fort Riley laboratories which are described in the second chapter varied in length from one-half day to five days; included commanders and their troops together, mixed groups of civilian and military personnel, and other combinations of

participants; employed sensitivity training and other forms of laboratory training; and had objectives ranging from personal growth to organization improvement to humanistic leadership. Some were conducted only once, some were curtailed "for administrative reasons," and others continued successfully for months or years.

Laboratory training and organization development among the Army chaplains were also described in Chapter 2. The extensive involvement of the chaplain branch began in 1970, when T-groups became a major tool in their race-relations training efforts. Laboratories were then, and have continued to be largely conducted by NTL, although part of the program has been aimed at the development of qualified chaplains to function as trainers. The focus of training has shifted over the years to organization development, and calls for basic changes in concepts of the chaplaincy and relationships with other systems in and out of the Army. Laboratories have been conducted with groups of all chaplains or mixtures of chaplains, non-chaplain officers, and enlisted men throughout the United States and Germany. Use has also been made of established NTL laboratories. Two of the major issues addressed in laboratories with chaplains have been social activism and ecumenism, which have become highly prized qualities for the new Army chaplain.

An organization development project at Fort Ord, California, has also been reported. Successful "awareness training" at Fort Ord in 1972 led to a Department of the

Army pilot project to investigate the value of organization development techniques in the Army. The OD Directorate, under the Commanding General of Fort Ord, has planned a two-year program which includes the use of awareness training, creativity training, communication training, community training, and team building, and the collection of objective data on the effects of the training. Begun in 1973, the project is scheduled for completion at Fort Ord by the end of 1974, and a trial application at a second installation is scheduled for 1975.

The two final cases of laboratory training described in Chapter 2 are isolated instances, not connected with the massive programs in the chaplain branch and at Fort Ord, nor with the efforts of Army psychologists. One employed the services of an outside consulting firm for a marginally successful weekend of training for "senior staff officers." The other case involved the efforts of a single Army chaplain to improve the lot of the "marginal soldier" and his value to his unit. The chaplain recommended the use of the encounter group to develop understanding and support among leaders from the commander to the squad leader.

The third chapter reexamines the training reported in Chapter 2, noting the positions represented on selected issues. In some areas it was found that all trainers agreed (that attendance should be voluntary, groups should be smaller than twenty-five participants, and, with one

exception, that training sessions on consecutive days was preferred to a less intense schedule, for example). In other areas there were differences. Although all agreed that support by commanders was essential for effective training, a number of approaches were tried for involving commanders in training. One was required to attend by the trainers, and others were required to attend by their superior commanders. But in most cases commanders were not directly involved as participants.

The qualifications and role of the trainer was a major area for disagreement. Two primary positions were represented by the psychologists, among whom it appeared that training in psychology, psychiatry or social work was the primary qualification for the trainer; and by the chaplains, where the NTL course for trainers was used to train chaplains. Psychologists reported in a number of cases attempts to train others to become trainers in brief exposures to laboratory training. In some cases they met with success, but in several they failed. In no case was a continuing training program successful without the continued efforts of the qualified trainer, however.

The fourth chapter is a critical examination of a few major aspects of the Army's experiences with laboratory training. In two major areas, research and the objectives of training, it was suggested that major deficiencies existed. In no case has research been adequately employed to determine whether objectives established for training have

been achieved. Control groups were not used, and in most cases trainers evaluated themselves. Almost total reliance was placed on the final evaluations by participants. That the objectives for most of the Army laboratories were similar to those established for many civilian laboratories was not considered sufficient reason to neglect careful research in the Army environment. A unique objective introduced into the chaplain training program was thought to be beyond the proper limits for laboratory training--the changing of chaplains into social activists with an ecumenical bias.

It was noted in the chapter that the diversity of training in the Army indicates a healthy attitude among individuals and organizations. There were no indications in the reported cases of training that any group of persons in the Army would be unsuitable for laboratory training, although differences had been noted in skills in groups, attitudes, and other characteristics. But it is possible that stereotyping of groups, such as the chaplains, may be counter to the interests of the groups and actually reduce the effects possible through laboratory training. Senior officers have been treated generally as a distinct breed of individuals also. While training for them in separate programs has been useful, it has also been suggested by training experiences that they can effectively train with their subordinates.

The centralized control evident in the chaplain training effort and at Fort Ord was suggested as necessary in massive programs, but ineffective in certain cases--such as the seeming lack of coordination between chaplain programs and Department of the Army evaluation efforts at Fort Ord, and between the chaplains and the existing psychologist-led programs at Fort Riley.

The conclusions which can be drawn from this study may be simply and briefly stated. As has been indicated earlier, the evidence is insufficient in most areas to to make conclusions on the many variables which may contribute to effective training. The beliefs and practices of trainers have been stated. To proceed temporarily under such guidance may be satisfactory. But it will be inexcusable to continue without careful and independent measurements and analysis, and publication of the results. The conclusions, then, are two:

1. Sensitivity training and organization development do have a place in the Army. Their "possibilities for constructive use" are good. But their continued effectiveness will depend upon intelligent planning, judicious applications, and thorough evaluations.

2. Research is essential. The efforts by Rohrbaugh and in the two major organization development programs should be considered only the beginnings of extensive investigations. It is not certain that if OD works at Fort Ord it will also

work elsewhere. Numerous variables must be included in research, including trainer personality and style, group composition and size, length and frequency of sessions, and duration of training, to name a few--none of which have been identified as part of research efforts with Army groups.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"After Action Report on the National Training Laboratory Human Relations Workshop." Disposition Form AETSBCH, 3rd Infantry Division, November 27, 1972.

Associated Press dispatch, The Leavenworth [Kansas] Times, June 28, 1972.

Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Back, Kurt. Beyond Words: The Story of Sensitivity Training and the Encounter Movement. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1972.

Bennis, Warren G., Edgar H. Schein, and David E. Berlew, eds. Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays and Readings on Human Interaction. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1964.

Burke, W. Warner. "A Comparison of Management Development and Organization Development," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, VII (September/October, 1971), 569-579.

Campbell, Donald T., and Thelma H. McCormack. "Military Experiences and Attitudes Toward Authority," American Journal of Sociology, LXII (March, 1957), 482-490.

Campbell, John P., and Marvin D. Dunnette. "Effectiveness of T-group Experiences in Managerial Training and Development," Psychological Bulletin, LXX (August, 1968), 73-104.

"CCL Evaluation of Twelve Brigadier General Designees," a memorandum within the Office of the Chief of Staff, United States Army, January, 1973.

"Chaplain Organization Development," letter DAAG-ASM DACH-PPZ-B, from Department of the Army to Commander, Continental Army Command, March 16, 1973.

Christie, Richard. Transition from Civilian to Army Life, Technical Report 13. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University Human Resources Research Office, October, 1954.

Cooper, C. L., and I. L. Mangham, eds. T-Groups: A Survey of Research. London: Wiley-Interscience, 1971.

Coulson, William R. Groups, Gimmicks, and Instant Gurus: An Examination of Encounter Groups and Their Distortions. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Datel, William E. "Contingency Management in Basic Combat Training," a paper presented at the Annual Current Trends in Army Medical Department Psychology Conference, December 14-18, 1970, Denver, and published by the Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., pp. 106-120.

Department of the Army. Draft Briefing Papers.

Egan, Gerard. Encounter: Group Processes for Interpersonal Growth. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Gibb, Jack R. "The Effects of Human Relations Training," in Allen E. Bergin and S. L. Garfield, eds. Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change. New York: Wiley, 1971, pp. 839-862.

Goldberg, Carl. Encounter: Group Sensitivity Training Experience. New York: Science House, 1970.

Gorner, Peter. "Encounter Groupies, Beware!" Chicago Tribune, April 28, 1973, sec. 1, p. 15.

Greening, Thomas C., and Hubert S. Coffey. "Working with an 'Impersonal' T Group," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, II (October-December, 1966), 401-411.

Hare, A. Paul. Handbook of Small Group Research. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Hislop, Alan. "Company Men," a book review, Saturday Review of the Arts, I (March 3, 1973), 70-71.

House, Robert J. "T-Group Education and Leadership Effectiveness: A Review of the Empiric Literature and a Critical Evaluation," Personnel Psychology, XX (Spring, 1967), 1-32.

Janowitz, Morris. The Military in the Political Development of New Nations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

_____. The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960.

Kuriloff, Arthur H., and Stuart Atkins. "T Group for a Work Team," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, II (January-March, 1966), 63-93.

Latta, William, and Sebastian Striefel. "A Workshop Approach to the Army Community," a paper presented at the American Psychologists' Convention, September 4, 1969.

Latta, William S., William F. Hummel, Jr., Sebastian Striefel, John S. Morrison III, and Jim L. Olsen. "Human Relations Training in the Army," a paper presented at the Annual Current Trends in Army Medical Department Psychology Conference, December 1-5, 1969, Denver, and published by the Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., pp. 172-197.

Letter from the Command Chaplain, United States Army, Europe, to Cyril R. Mill, May 11, 1972.

Libby, Billy W., and Michael Rohrbaugh. "A Case Study: Behavioral Science Applications in a Small Army Unit," Social Change, II (Number 3, 1972), 5-6.

_____. "Talking it Out: Antidote for Company Morale Problems," Army, XXII (December, 1972), 39-41.

Lieberman, Morton A., Irvin D. Yalom, and Matthew B. Miles. "The Impact of Encounter Groups on Participants: Some Preliminary Findings," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, VIII (January/February, 1972), 29-50.

Lifton, Robert J. "The 'Gook Syndrom' and 'Numbed Warfare,'" Saturday Review of the Society, LV (December, 1972), 66-72.

Malone, Dandridge M. "The Prize," Army, XXIII (March, 1973), 24-31.

Mill, Cyril R. "A Changing Concept of the Chaplaincy," Military Chaplains' Review, II (January, 1973), 22-30.

_____. "Human Relations Training for Chaplains, USAREUR and 7th Army," December 12, 1971.

_____. "OD in a Macrosystem--A Three-year Progress Report," a paper presented at the NTL Conference on New Technology in Organization Development, December 1, 1972, Washington, D.C.

_____. Remarks to the Pastors' Conference, March 21, 1973, St. Louis. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "Report to the Chief of Chaplains re: Training in USAREUR, October-November, 1972."

_____. Telephone conversation with the writer, April 30, 1973.

Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Mills, Theodore M. The Sociology of Small Groups. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Oasis Midwest Center for Human Potential, catalog, Summer, 1973.

OD Plan, OD Directorate, Fort Ord, California.

Parker, Raymond L., and Michael Rohrbaugh. "School of Command Leadership--Progress Report and Recommendations for Change in Orientation," Disposition Form ALBFDA-CT, Fort Riley, Kansas, July 7, 1971.

"A Proposal for Executive Development and Leadership Training for U.S. Army Chaplains," NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, Washington, D.C., November 26, 1971.

"A Proposal for Executive Development and Leadership Training for U.S. Army Chaplains, FY '73," NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, Washington, D.C., March 1, 1972.

"A Proposal for the Training of Army Base Chaplains in Human Relations and Applied Behavioral Science," NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, Washington, D.C., May 7, 1970.

Reed, John H. "Personal Insight Discovery Group: A Pilot Project for Army Battalion and/or Battery Size Units," unpublished paper.

Rogers, Carl R. Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

_____. "Dealing with Psychological Tensions," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, I (January-March, 1965), 6-24.

Rohrbaugh, Michael. "Evaluation of CPO Seminar in Interpersonal Relationships," draft paper, March, 1973.

_____. Personal correspondence with the writer, January 27, 1973.

Sanford, Fillmore H. "Research on Military Leadership," in John C. Flanagan and others. Current Trends: Psychology in the World Emergency. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1952, pp. 17-74.

Schaum, Fred W. "Develop the Soldier," Army Times, March 28, 1973, pp. 12, 22.

Schein, Edgar H. Organizational Psychology. 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Schein, Edgar H., and Warren G. Bennis, eds. Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Schneider, Andrew. "Understanding Body Language," Family, January 17, 1973, pp. 8-9.

_____. "Your Body's Shouting So Much I Can't Hear What You're Saying!" Family, January 17, 1973, pp. 6-7.

"Seminar in Interpersonal Relationships--Course Description," Civilian Personnel Office, Fort Riley, Kansas.

Singer, C. Gregg. "A Cultural Intrusion," The Presbyterian Journal, XXXII (May 30, 1973), 1, 7-9.

Striefel, Sebastian. "A New Role for Mental Health Professionals in the Army," a paper presented at the Annual Current Trends in Army Medical Department Psychology Conference, December 1-5, 1969, Denver, and published by the Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., pp. 165-171.

Striefel, Sebastian, and William Latta. "Human Relations Training with Correctional Staff," unpublished paper.

Striefel, Sebastian, John S. Morrison III, and William Latta, "A New Role for Mental Health Professionals in the Army," unpublished paper.

Thomas, Charles A., Jr. "The Role of the Behavioral Scientist in the Modern Volunteer Army," a paper presented at the Annual Social and Preventive Psychiatry Conference, February 8-12, 1971, Washington, D.C.

Thomas, M. Duane. "Developing Human Potential Through Group Interaction: A Study of Changes in Personality Factors, Personal Attitudes, and Group Functioning in University Students Participating in Human Relations Training." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Kansas, 1970.

"Troops Call Jobs a Waste," Army Times, April 4, 1973, p. 8.

United Press International dispatch, The University Daily Kansan, March 12, 1970.

"What is OD?" NTL Institute News and Reports, II (June, 1968).

Wright, Wendell T. "A Training Program for Army Chaplains in Human Relations and Applied Behavioral Science," Military Chaplains' Review, II (January, 1973), 31-37.

Yarmolinsky, Adam. The Military Establishment: Its Impacts on American Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

WORKSHOP FOR ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT PROFESSIONALS

Design

Our goals in the workshop portion of the Current Trends Conference were twofold: First, we wanted to convey to the participants certain exercises and techniques and the rationale for their use. We thought of this as cognitive input necessary if the workshop participants were to begin some version of a Human Relations Training program in their "back home" situations. Secondly, we wanted the workshop to have an experiential flavor so that the participants would be able to appreciate in a "gut" way the effect of a workshop approach on those who participated.

During meetings which began before the conference started and continued throughout the conference, the five of us who were responsible for the workshop attempted to achieve a mutually agreeable design and to alter this design as changing conditions warranted.

The experience we designed (Table I) was intended to combine experiential and cognitive learnings in such a way that the participants would proceed through an activity (e.g. Paraphrase 1) in a series of steps. First, they were to engage in the behavior requested, then relate the behavior to their current feelings (what does the experience mean to me now?). Second, they were to relate their present feelings and learnings to their back-home behavior as individuals (both on-the-job and social behavior). Third, they were to step back and consider the experience from the point of view of the trainers rather than the participants. We wanted the participants to gain some insight as to why the five trainers had chosen this particular technique and why we were using it at this particular time in the two-day workshop. Fourth, we wanted the participants to consider the various ramifications of using this technique with a variety of groups and for a variety of purposes. This related most specifically to the participants' use of the technique in their back-home environment.

As indicated in Table I, we planned to use both a large group (all participants together) and a number of small groups. We planned for steps one and two to occur

---

Extracted from Latta and others, pp. 181-184, 187-188.

exclusively in the small group situation and for steps three and four to occur exclusively in the large group setting.

By way of structural or procedural plans, we arranged one part of the meeting area into a large horseshoe-shaped ring of chairs. Since we expected about 50 participants, we arranged 5 groups of 12 chairs (each group in a circle, with a coffee table, water, etc. in the middle) around the meeting area in such a manner that no group excessively interfered with another group. In addition, we asked participants to wear name tags with first names only and to leave their uniform blouses in the cloak room prior to beginning each day's session (sessions lasted from 8 a.m. til 4:30 p.m.). These interventions were designed to achieve some sense of physical togetherness during the large group experiences, yet allow privacy during the small group sessions. In addition, removing blouses with their insignia and using only first names would hopefully speed up the unfreezing of previously learned behavior (e.g. rank structure) between some of the participants.

Workshop

Table II outlines the workshop as it was actually accomplished. A number of changes were made in the design. We discovered that a combination of several slow-starting small groups and a lengthy "working through" of the participants' anger toward their situation and toward the trainers resulted in time for only the first part of the paraphrase exercise.

During the first day's lunch break, each of the five trainers discussed his analysis of the quality and quantity of his small group interaction. In addition, we tried to arrive at some "feel" for the groups as a whole. We concluded that the small groups were coming along more slowly than we had anticipated and were just beginning to work together as a group. Consequently, we decided to alter our design by substituting an activity involving intra-group cooperation, the NASA Exercise, for the previously scheduled activity. Since this would alter the second day's schedule (the NASA Exercise had been scheduled for the second morning), we arranged an evening meeting to reorganize our plan for the second day. During our evening planning session, our consensus was that the participants had become involved and were favorably inclined toward the following day. Since the participants had been exposed to so few actual techniques the first day, we attempted to provide a variety of such activities during the second day. In addition, several of

the trainers were concerned lest their groups move more in the direction of a traditional T-group than we considered desirable, commensurate with our goal of maximizing cognitive input.

With these conclusions in mind, we altered day two as indicated in Table II. Since some of the groups were becoming "T-groupish" (which was not part of the overall plan), we decided for the "old group" to meet for an hour, then to disband. Next, we planned to begin a rather extensive microlab (Table III). Our thinking here was that a microlab would build in a large number of experiences in an orderly sequence and would also hopefully result in the building of stronger relationships among the participants.

For the afternoon of the second day, we planned to concentrate solely on the cognitive aspects of the workshops--especially on the ramifications of various lab designs.

Day two activities proceeded as planned. The microlab options were intentionally more extensive than the time allocated to allow each small group to participate in individual selection of activities listed under "SG" in Table III rather than in the total number listed.

TABLE I

Workshop as Designed

Session	Activity	Group Size
	Day One	
Morning	Introduction	LG*
	Buzz Groups--Feelings	SG**
	Discussion	LG
	Buzz Groups--Goals	SG
	Discussion	LG
	Paraphrase I	SG
	Coffee Break	
	Paraphrase II	SG
	Discussion	LG
Afternoon	Coin Game	SG
	Discussion	LG
	Coffee Break	
	Helping Trios	LG-Trios
	Discussion	LG
	Where are we now?	LG
	Day Two	
Morning	Discussion	
	NASA Exercise (Includes coffee break)	LG, Individual, SG
Afternoon	Microlab	LG-SG
	Discussion	LG
	Evaluation	LG

*All participants together in one group
** Participants separated into five small groups

TABLE II

Workshop as Accomplished

Session	Activity	Group Size
	Day One	
Morning	Introduction	LG*
	Buzz Groups--Feelings	SG**
	Discussion	LG
	Buzz Groups--Goals	SG
	Discussion	LG
	Coffee Break	
	Paraphrase I	SG
	Discussion	LG
Afternoon	NASA Exercise	LG, Individual, SG
	Coffee Break	
	Discussion	LG
	Where are we now?	LG
	Day Two	
Morning	Old Small Group	SG
	Coffee Break	
	Microlab	LG-SG
Afternoon	Discussion	LG
	Evaluation	LG

*All participants together in one group
**Participants separated into five small groups

TABLE III

Microlab Options

LG: Milling--no talking
Pairing--with someone you want to know better
Sit back to back--talk about how you feel now
Milling--no talking
Pairing--with someone you want to know better
Get to know person with eyes only, then talk about how you feel now
Milling--no talking
Get to know person with your hand only (eyes closed, no talking), then talk about how you feel now
Milling--no talking
Separate into five groups--people you don't know but would like to know better

SG: Talk about how you feel right now
Metaphores
Talk about feelings
Nonverbal feedback
Talk about feelings
Aggression (arm wrestle, pushing, Indian wrestling, thumb and finger wrestling)
Talk about feelings
Trust (blindfold, falling backwards)
Talk about feelings
Coin game
Counseling trios
Passing around
Talk about feelings of ending group

Appendix B

TYPICAL NTL WORKSHOP, GERMANY, 1972

First Day

Welcome and introductions

With the group sitting in trios, discuss, "Why was I selected to come to this workshop, and how do I feel about being here?"

Report out from the trios

Trainers write out workshop goals, such as: "To increase our communication skills, such as listening and giving clear feedback," "To learn how to develop a team that can work together," "To discuss important army issues such as race, drugs, and discipline,' "To learn how to handle problems which arise between groups."

Establish a contract between trainers and participants--an open understanding of how we were to work together

(Coffee Break)

Team building exercise

(Lunch)

Theory presentation on openness and feedback (Johari Window)

Intergroup game around trust formation (Disarmament Game)

(Dinner)

In three groups, chaplains, NCO's and line officers, the task "Prepare three lists of words or phrases: (1) What we (members of our group) expect of (members of the other groups) in order to help us to do our job better; (2) What we expect of them in order to help us to do our jobs better (for members of the second other group); and (3) How we think other people generally would describe us.

Post the newsprint sheets around the room and begin to share the information on them and to talk about the issues which arose from them.

Second Day

Continue with the sharing and discussion from the previous evening

(Coffee Break)

Each person working alone: "Make a list of your ac-

Adapted from Cyril Mill, "Report to the Chief of Chaplains."

tivities on a typical day."

In groups of six, share the typical day and identify problems you have in getting your work done.

In these same groups of six, write out the description of a problem that is arising on an army post. It might reflect deteriorating race relations, a rise in drug abuse, or any sort of human and organizational problem.

(Lunch)

Exchange your problem with another group. Working as a team, devise a solution to the problem described by the other team. Tell all of the things you would do as a team, the resources you would call upon, or the interventions you would recommend to the Commandant to take care of the problem.

Share the problems and solutions with the whole community.

Complete the evaluation form.

Adjourn.

In some of the workshops we used a group problem-solving exercise, or a staff member would introduce, through a brief theory presentation, such concepts as the effect of rapid change on feelings of security, the tendency to attribute motives falsely to others, how to spot white racism and institutional racism, or other topics relevant to the group interest.

Appendix C

AWARENESS TRAINING--FORT ORD

Day One

At 0800, eight to fourteen members, in duty attire, join the facilitator (group leader) and his co-facilitator in a relaxed, comfortable room. The facilitator then provides members of the groups with the following specific instructions:

1. Remain open and honest with each other at all times.

2. Remain informal. Feel free to walk around, go to the latrine, help yourself to coffee, etc.

3. Maintain confidentiality (with the exception of your wife) with regard to everything that takes place in this room.

4. Feel free to leave the seminar if your values do not coincide with openness, or if you feel that you cannot cope with the intensive personal interactions.

5. Ask for and give "feedback," defined as any reaction felt about or toward oneself or another member of the group.

6. When you receive feedback, make sure that it is understood and well defined, then check it out with other group members.

7. Never speculate about why people are the way they are, but tell them how you feel about it.

8. The more you participate, the more you will learn.

9. Talk to people, not at or about them.

The members are next asked to keep in mind the goals of increasing their abilities to effectively communicate in a sensitive, empathic, perceptive manner and increasing awareness of self and others through expansion of leadership abilities. In addition, each member is urged to find and state his individual and group goals which have not been

---

From the OD Plan, pp. D-1-2 to D-1-9.

stated by the facilitator. The following series of exercises then begins:

0830-1200--Team Building Triads

Goal: To facilitate the involvement of individuals in a newly formed group.

Method: Four triads meet separately to reveal present feelings about self and first impressions of others. Each triad then conveys to the other nine group members what they have learned about themselves. The nine listening members give feedback to the three presenting members, with a focus on approachability, respect, and desire to work for, with, or above each man.

1330-1500--Group Counseling Techniques via Role Playing and Role Reversals

Goal: To give each member the chance to (1) counsel his peers, (2) see himself role played by a peer, (3) learn to give and receive both criticism and affection in a mature, constructive manner.

Method: Two groups of six members each meet separately. Each group presents an original skit to the other group in order to convey what happened during its counseling session.

1500-1530--Blake and Mouton's Leadership Grid

Goal: (1) To evaluate oneself in terms of "task orientation" (attitude toward accomplishing the mission by giving orders and meeting time demands) and "people orientation" (attitude toward accomplishing a mission by talking with people as <u>people</u> and showing a desire to make others feel important). (2) To enable each member to expand his leadership style which would meet the demands of both his mission and subordinates, colleagues, and superiors in the most effective manner. (3) To enable each member to adapt his leadership style in order to be the kind of leader who wins both love and respect. For example, the tough, tactless leader needs to be more tactful and the soft, popular leader needs to be more demanding.

1530-1630--Enhancement of Empathy

Goal: To provide feedback to a group concerning modes of communication in a problem solving group; to provide experience for group members in observing each other in group meetings; to reveal time-saving methods leaders can use in committee and staff meetings.

Method: (1) The group is split into two groups of six members each and then the two groups are combined into one large group. Both the small group and the large group have the following mission: To decide upon the top five problems in their group. (2) The large group then selects two members to act as leaders who then facilitate a discussion of the roles each member played in the preceding problem-oriented discussion. Members tend to learn how they "come off" to others, such as "too dominant," "too passive," or "too tough." (3) During the middle of this discussion the facilitator asks each member to stop and write down what he has heard, as a check on listening and distorting.

1630-1700--Listening

Goal: To understand that listening is a two-way process.

Method: The group is split into two groups of six each. Each member tells his group the worst thing that has ever happened to him in the past ten years, the best thing that has happened to him in the past ten years, and his middle name. The members are tested on how well they listened to each other during the experience, and the usual person-to-person feedback follows.

Day Two

0900-1200--Audio-Video Tape Feedback

Goal: To provide the opportunity for each group member to see and hear himself as he interacts with other members.

Method: (1) Each member tells the entire group, while being recorded for 2-4 minutes, what he needs to do to improve his task-people leadership style, how he plans to do so, and whom he chooses from the group to help him. (2) The member views himself, critiques himself, and is critiqued by the group.

1300-1430--Hidden Agendas

Goal: To create an awareness of underlying motivations which govern an individual's behavior in an organization.

Method: (1) Five persons receive roles to play, five are observers, and two serve as recorders. Observations are reported. The role players later reveal their roles to the group. (2) A member is selected to lead a discussion on how hidden agendas affect their organizations and how they can best be handled in a constructive manner.

1430-1530--Lost on the Moon

Goals: To develop organizational commitment; to focus on the decision-making norms of the group; to discover "natural leadership."

Methods: (1) The group is split into two groups of six members each. (2) Each group member individually ranks from most important to least important fifteen items needed for survival on the moon. (3) Then each group is asked to employ the method of group consensus to reach a group decision on the task. This means that the prediction for each of the fifteen survival items must be agreed upon by each group member before it becomes a part of the group decision. (4) Individual and group scores are derived and the results are compared and discussed.

1630-1715--Management of Affection

Goal: To learn how to give and receive positive feedback (affection) in one's organization.

Method: (1) Each member walks up to other members toward whom he feels positively, and gives them affection any way that he can. (2) The members discuss the problems of giving and receiving verbal, social rewards to each other and how to do so in their own units. One of the problems discussed is "mixed signals," i.e., do people say what they want to say. For example, many members are unaware of their body language, and may verbally give affection to another person, and at the same time avoid eye contact or stand across the room.

Day Three

At 0800 the group completes a written critique of the entire seminar, a personal evaluation of the facilitator and all other members, and takes part in spontaneous creative affection through the presentation of original, symbolic gifts to each other. The gift giving is followed by the arrival of their commander or supervisor, who receives recommendations from the groups concerning what they perceive to be the top five problems within the organization.