Climate for Trust Formation

Jack R. *Gibb*[1]

A person learns to grow through his increasing acceptance of himself and others. Serving as the primary block to such acceptance are the defensive feelings of fear and distrust that arise from the prevailing defensive climates in most cultures. In order to participate consciously in his own growth a person must learn to create for himself, in his dyadic and group relationships, defense-reductive climates that will continue to reduce his own fears and distrusts.

Arising inevitably from all social interaction are four modal concerns: acceptance, data-flow, goal formation, and social control. These modal concerns arise in all social structure. They are brought into focus of awareness and are articulated by orientation toward process in the T Group. These concerns generate intrinsic motivations to reduce the concerns, and this reduction produces movement and growth. Significant and enduring movement toward concern-reduction in the last three areas can be made only as movement is made on the acceptance dimension.

A person can learn to grow as a person through learning how to create for himself defense-reductive climates that continue to reduce his fears and distrusts; he thus makes change possible along the other three dimensions. The critical function of the T Group is to augment this process of personal learning. The person learns to participate with others in creating a defense-reductive climate, becomes aware of the processes of such creation, and learns how to generalize these learnings to other dyadic and group situations. That is, he learns how to create the interpersonal situations which will help him to accept himself and others—to grow and to help others to grow.[2]

It is possible to describe effective behavior for T-Group members and trainers in terms of the above theory. Two hypothetical, idealized models for member- or trainer-behavior are outlined below. A "persuasive behavior" model leads to minimal growth along the four dimensions, and a "participative behavior" model leads to maximal growth.

The Four Modal Concerns

  Our research on a wide variety of groups in various life settings indicates the apparent validity of the assumption that there are four basic concerns that arise inevitably from all social interaction. As indicated in Table 1, these modal concerns specify four dimensions of personal and group growth. These concerns generate intrinsic forces that reduce the concerns and produce personal and group movement. The categories are in no sense discrete, but are highly interdependent.

Table 1   Modal Concerns in Group Development

Primary Modal Concerns	*Derivative Modal Concerns*	*Symptoms of Unresolved Concern*	*Symptoms of Resolved Concern*
Acceptance	Membership	Fear Distrust	Acceptance Trust
Data	Decision	Polite facade Caution strategy	Spontaneity Process feedback
Goal	Productivity	Apathy Competition	Creative work or play
Control	Organization	Dependency Counterdependency	Interdependence Role distribution

  The *acceptance* concern has to do with the formation of trust and acceptance of self and of others, the reduction of fear of self and of others, and the consequent growth of confidence. This concern becomes differentiated into concerns about degrees of *membership* in the various groups of which the person is a part. The *data-flow* concern has to do with the flow of feeling and perceptual data through the person or through the group; the system output of behavioral cues and all communicative evidence of attitudes, feelings, and perceptions; and the system input of such data. This concern finds its expression in *decision* making and choice behavior in the group. The *goal-formation* concern has to do with the continuing assessment of intrinsic motivations in the person or the group and the integration of motivations at various levels into action sequences, problem solving, and decision making. This concern becomes differentiated into a concern about *productivity,* about doing work, having fun, creating ideas, learning, or growing. The *control* dimension has to do with intrapersonal and interpersonal control or regulatory mechanisms that lead to coordinated sequences of behavior in the person,

sequential flow of behavior in the group, formation of roles and expectancies, and integration of function into structure at all levels of social behavior. This process becomes a concern about *organization,* which, in the sense we are using the term, has all degrees of formality, stability, awareness, and complexity in all variety of social relationships.

The Modal Concerns as Methodological Tools. These four concerns are the continually recurring themes or processes of all groups. They are modal in the sense of being the most common concerns of the greatest number of group members at the time of analysis. The concerns exist at all levels of awareness. A member may have deeply unconscious or barely subliminal fears about self-adequacy or distrusts of self and others (acceptance concern). He may have a deep sense of depersonalization and isolation from the groups in which he has ambivalence about membership (data concern). The member may feel a loss of identity, a feeling of not knowing who he is or what he wants from life (goal concern). He could develop a deep feeling that he cannot get himself to do what he wants to do or exert any significant influence on the world of which he is a part (control concern).

The concerns pervade all interpersonal relationships. At other, more conscious, levels of awareness a person may build elaborate checks and balances in his social world to keep from accepting full membership (acceptance concern); deliberately distort his output of feelings and thoughts to maintain personal or corporate images (data concern); engage in frenetic off-target work in an effort to find himself or to keep from finding himself (goal concern); or engage in various kinds of personable or persuasive behavior to get others to conform to his control demands (control concern).

In groups and organizations one sees the rise and persistence of inspection systems, policing functions, and membership regulations (acceptance concern); of parliamentary rules and an elaborate grapevine (data concern); or merit badges and work incentive systems (goal concern); and of committee chairmen, organization charts, and job specification sheets (control concern).

There is some evidence for the methodological usefulness of this four-unit categorization:

1. The concerns are apparently universal in occurrence in work, action, training, and therapy groups. They continually recur in the , verbal and nonverbal behavior of group members.

2. The categories show a relatively good fit with categories of mental health and personality development as seen in the clinical literature (cf. Table 2).

3. Experimental manipulation of each of the four major variables seems to produce increments or decrements in group effectiveness.

4. Our studies of group growth indicate that significant changes occur along each of the four dimensions with prolonged training or therapy.

5. Examination of the anthropological studies of group behavior and organizational structure indicates the prevalence of these four concerns.

6. Handling of the concern by a group is frequently accompanied by high emotionality, neurotic persistence, or neurotic denial.

7. The categories have high validity for trainees in group therapy, group education, or group training.

8. The categories have face validity for naive group members, who can easily identify, from their own experiences, instances of change along each of the four dimensions.

The Contingency Hierarchy. Our studies strongly suggest a consistent genetic sequence in the rise of the four concerns in social structure. The deepest and earliest concerns arise in the following order: acceptance, data-flow, goal formation, and control. Development of each factor in this order seems to facilitate subsequent development of the other factors. Growth of all social structure occurs as a concurrent and interdependent development on each of the four dimensions, but optimal growth occurs when the factors "lead" one another in the optimal sequence. The basic order of development is often camouflaged at the phenotypical or manifest level. For example, immediate attempts at handling the control function arise out of distrust and are essentially directed at resolution of the acceptance concern. Early attempts at goal setting may be strategies to manipulate the flow of data and are made sensible when seen as attempts at resolution of the data-flow concern.

Growth in each dimension is contingent upon growth in each of the dimensions higher in the hierarchy. Each factor in the hierarchy provides a pace-setting or boundary function for the factors lower in the hierarchy. Thus, data-flow is possible only within the limits of trust formation. A free flow of data is possible only with antecedent or concurrent reduction of distrusts and fears. Defense mechanisms and organizational demands prevent functional processing of data beyond the trust limits. A person can look at his goals only as he begins to trust himself. This growing self-trust makes self-awareness possible. Integration of group goals occurs only as rapidly as members build sufficient trust and awareness to verbalize openly their intrinsic goals. Premature goal formulation beyond the trust and data boundaries leads to unrealistic, overaspirational, or formalized goals, the pursuit or lack of pursuit of which leads to apathy or various other forms of resistance. Stable and functional organizational structure is possible only as goals have been achieved through adequate reality processing of data within the trust boundaries of the organization. In the early stages of group growth, organization is maintained by an appropriate degree of formalization of control mechanisms, imposition of extrinsic goals, filtering of the communication system, and checks and balances appropriate to the trust level. In the later stages of group growth, the organization, growing from a free flow of data in relatively high trust, becomes spontaneously generated through integration of intrinsic motivations. In early stages of organization, the structure is to some degree maintained by fear, strategy, persuasion, and power. In later stages, the structure comes to be maintained by trust, reality-data, intrinsic motivations, and interdependence of roles.

ACCEPTANCE. It became dramatically evident in our early experimentation with groups that members come with unresolved feelings of fear and distrust. These feelings are often denied and deeply buried. Sometimes they are fairly near the surface. They are apparently rooted in lack of acceptance of the self and consequent lack of acceptance of others. The facades produced by socialization make it difficult for a person to find himself, accept himself, or trust himself.

One sees many symptoms of distrust, particularly in the early stages of group formation: persistent defense of one's public image, attempts to change attitudes and beliefs of others, attempts to make decisions for others, avoidance of feeling, avoidance of conflict, advice giving, flattery, cynicism about the powers of the group, derogation of the group's abilities, maintenance of formality in behavior and in control mechanisms, lack of confidence in the product of the group, and denial of membership. In action groups where distrust is strong, one sees insistence upon control, rigid preplanning of the group agenda, preservation of social distance, or fear of controversy.

Under the frequent defense-productive climates in social groups, members and leaders maintain fear and distrust. Lacking confidence in what the group can do, they try to find strong or expert leaders. Fearing the exposure that comes from informality and intimate social action, they insist upon formal rules. Believing that "familiarity breeds contempt," they insist that things be kept on an impersonal basis. Feeling that the group cannot be trusted to make progress on its own, they try to set up rigid procedural specifications. Assuming that other members cannot make decisions for themselves, they attempt to persuade, influence, and control the beliefs of others. Feeling that they will be unable to handle conflict and chaos, they appoint strong leaders to whom they assign the critical functions of problem solving and group maintenance.

The problem of acceptance becomes further differentiated into a concern for membership in the group. Individuals become concerned with the questions of how they can attain membership, how they can be heard, how they can be seen as important by the other members. With productive work in certain social situations, persons earn membership by coming to lose their fears of one another and to trust one another in the situation. With process awareness in group training or therapy, members Come to find that membership is a matter of fear reduction and trust formation. Experiences which produce trust tend to reduce the incidence of the symptoms cited above.

DATA-FLOW. After a T Group has attempted to move in some direction and has thwarted itself to some degree, it runs into a complex problem that is largely buried beneath the surface of natural groups. This is the problem of finding out how group members feel, how they see things, and what their attitudes are about the relevant concerns of the group. How do we know what we want to do? Even if we as individuals know our own intrinsic motivations, how do we find out what others think and what their motivations are?

A kind of datalessness is present in most natural work groups that finds expression in many symptoms. The process of socialization produces a facade which camouflages data output. Members develop many mannerisms for covering up feelings and perceptions. They deny feelings, flatter others, speak with artificial politeness, show great concern over hurting someone's feelings, and engage in much polite "weather" talk. With socialization, people develop great skills at covering up data output. Data input is also reduced under the defensive climates of ordinary living. People who are defensive produce their own screens that prevent them from seeing the data that are present, and from responding to the cues that do exist.

Under the extrinsic control systems of high-defense groups, people often do not find out that they lack data. When groups make decisions, they make inappropriate assumptions, such as "silence means consent," or that the reverse is true. Such assumptions lead to inadequate data-

flow, which, in turn, causes groups to continue to operate with partial efficiency or without knowledge that they are operating with partial efficiency. When, through some form of data collection, the group finds out some of the previously hidden data, a partial paralysis often slows down the group efficiency while the members learn how to handle the new data and the complacency shock which comes from the realization that unseen and relevant data were present all the time.

With training and growth, the group learns to collect data more effectively. In varying degrees people can learn to listen, to express feelings and perceptions With candor and honesty, to be somewhat more spontaneous in their actions, and to integrate emotionality into work.

The problem of data processing ramifies into the problem of decision making and choice. Indeed, it is usually in the process of making decisions that the group becomes aware that data are inadequate for the purposes toward which the group is marshaling force. The group becomes concerned with how decisions are made, how members feel about various alternatives that arise, and how members can produce other verbalized alternatives.

With group development, these symptoms are reduced and data become more adequately processed.

GOAL.   Groups soon find that people will not accept goals imposed by others. Groups find that goals must be created in interaction. An early problem in group formation is the determination of joint goals. What do we want to work at? What do we want to do? Can we find something that we want to do together? The more freedom that is allowed to the group, the more blurred this problem becomes and the more clear the magnitude of it.

There are many signs of the existence of this unresolved concern in groups. In natural groups, goals are always to some degree imposed by leaders or peers. People impose goals upon others by various coercive or persuasive methods. People who have only partial commitment to joint purposes are often apathetic or bored. Others may work from a sense of duty or loyalty to the leaders, to friends in the group, or to the general aims of the group. People who work from such extrinsic motivations may engage in spurts of frenetic activity, perhaps to "get it over with" or perhaps to show themselves that they are loyal, competitive, or "good members" of the organization.

In natural, high-defense groups, a fabric of external controls is often imposed by administering extrinsic rewards in the forms of grades, money, approval, or other kudos. Activity under extrinsic motivation is less than full commitment of the person to the task. In T Groups, where people are forced by the nature of the social contract to examine goals and to *create* goals, as it were, the fragile nature of the extrinsic commitments is revealed.

Groups, because they are unable to assess own motivations, will ask the trainer to give them goals. Lacking visible and verbalized common goals, they may decide to do something "just to get something done." Like the airline pilot in the popular joke, they may not be sure where they are going but they are making good speed getting there. People have acquired the habit of working-to be working. Once the group has made the decision to move in some direction it may

then proceed to move but may show many signs of passive resistance in the form of out-of-field activity, whispering, irrelevant debate, or semantic quibbling.

Derived from the concern about purpose is the problem of being productive. What is productivity for us? How can we grow, be creative, learn, achieve something related to our intrinsic selves? What are we? and What do we want out of life? are questions to which the unresolved answers cause tension and concern. That people have not achieved for themselves an adequate working solution to these questions is revealed in the chaotic escape work that they create when given freedom in the T Group.

Natural groups and T Groups may achieve, with growth, a kind of development to the state where the group is engaged in sustained, meaningful, and creative activity which is close to the intrinsic motivations of the participants. High interest and greater spread of participation accompany this kind of work. External controls or rewards in the form of competition or trainer-approval are not necessary under these circumstances and, indeed, have little effect upon performance.

CONTROL. Early in the T Group, the members become confronted with the problems of exerting influence in the group. "How can I exert some control over what happens?" "How can I control my own impulses and internal forces?" "How can I influence others in the group?"

This problem grows into the problem of organization. "How can we organize to do what we want to do?" "Supposing we have found out our purposes through adequate data processing, how can we exert control over one another and the forces we produce through our interaction?"

In a very real sense, the control problem disappears when data-collection and interpersonal-acceptance problems are solved. When people are doing what they want to do, know that they are doing what they want to do, and have developed some trust and acceptance in the group situation, the control and organization problems become relatively simple or disappear.

Indications that there are unresolved control problems in the group are prevalent in natural groups as well as in T Groups. People who have unresolved control concerns will engage in various persuasive methods for controlling others: advice giving, debate, argument, or constructive fight. A power struggle may develop among members who desire to have things move their way or enjoy leadership, control, or power. Strategies for manipulation may be developed. These may follow roles of debate and be in the open or may be developed by subgroups outside the total group. People may appeal to the leader or trainer to control them. People may fight all forms of control and rather enjoy the luxury of lack of organization.

As groups develop, signs of resolving the concerns occur. Problem solving roles become distributed in the group and may arise spontaneously in response to immediate problem-solving needs. Conflict may disappear, or may become more productive and directed toward problem solution. Activity may become more smoothly regulated. Regulatory functions in the group are performed more effectively. Interdependence is increased.

Group Development

Implicit in the foregoing section is a theory of group development. The critical dimensions upon which groups change are specified by the four modal concerns. As suggested in Table 2, growth is an interdependent process. As persons develop, they are better able to participate in group growth. Persons are better able to grow when they are attaining membership in a developing group. This is not to say that healthy individuals necessarily produce healthy groups or that a healthy group necessarily produces healthy individuals. In the natural state, individuals and groups are in the processes of change. Healthy individuals and groups show directionality in this change-interdependent movement along the four dimensions specified.

Table 2   Dimensions in Group and Personal Growth

Primary Modal Concerns	*Derivative Modal Concerns*	*Signs of Personal Growth*	*Signs of Group Growth*
Acceptance	Membership	Acceptance of self and others	Supportive climate, climate of trust
Data	Decision	Spontaneity, awareness	Reality communication, functional feedback
Goal	Productivity	Integration, directionality	Goal integration, tractability level
Control	Organization	Interdependence	Interdependence, participative action and structure

Many theorists have made analogies describing the process of group formation as a spiral, a series of cycles, or a series of stages which succeed one another as new phases occur in growth. Our studies suggest that group growth is no more saltatory than individual growth. What seems most likely is that group growth is a gradualistic and global process, in which themes and subthemes may intertwine but in which the dramatic quality is the wholeness, or the *Gestalt.* The modal concerns we describe are products of analysis—methodological tools which simplify the task of the diagnostician but bring an artifactitious quality to the flow of processes in the developing group. To say that there are probably no *stages* of development is not to say that there are no consistent sequential changes in looking at groups over a time span. In the Colorado studies, for example, we brought both naive and trained

observers in to observe the third and fifty-eighth hours of the T Groups. All observers agreed on the presence of dramatic changes on the four modal dimensions. In contrast to this high agreement, there was low interobserver agreement in identifying interim "stages" of growth on the four dimensions.

In the last section, we saw certain symptoms of immature groups in early stages of formation. The symptoms of what a theoretical model of a mature group might be are difficult to predict. According to our theory, such a group would have optimal interpersonal trust and acceptance, functional feedback of all relevant data, creative activity that was satisfying intrinsic motivations, and an interdependent function and structure. Bennis (see Chapter 9) has done a careful and helpful job of describing many of the changes that often take place along the control dimension during group development. Space prevents our detailing in a similar way the changes that take place along the other three dimensions.[3]

Analysis of the tapes and coded observations of the T Groups on the Office of Naval Research program indicates that change on some of the dimensions does occur in all cases. It is impossible from our data for us to build at this point a completely satisfying sequential model. It does seem clear that, in some groups, change is in cyclic or spiral form, with movement back and forth across dimensions. In other groups, change seems to proceed in dramatic and unpredictable spurts. In other groups, long periods pass with either regressive movement or plateaus of no progress, with occasional dramatic spurts at the end. Most of the data we have are on groups of two or three weeks' duration, making a total of 20 to 30 hours in group time. In some cases, our Colorado groups continued for as long as 240 hours, over a period of nine months. In all cases, groups that continued for over 60 hours made significant progress on the measures we used.

Major symptoms of what a hypothetical group in a high state of development might be are presented in Table 2. Elaborations and additional symptoms are presented in the paragraphs below and are summarized in Table 6. The symptoms are all derived from our observations of groups that had been under intensive T-Group training for more than 60 hours. Not all symptoms were present in all" groups in comparable degree. The statements made below represent extrapolations from empirical data and are characteristic of what a composite, idealized model would be. The language problems here are very difficult, and the statements made below represent a high degree of abstraction from the operational data coming from the various research instruments.

ACCEPTANCE. Groups with high acceptance show a reduction of fear and distrust. There is a reduction of humor and an increase of warmth that are perceived by members as genuine and often characterized as "nothing like what I have seen before." Deviations from the norm are accepted, often encouraged. There is a high amount of confidence in the ability of the group, with minimal concern about comparing the group with other groups.

DATA-FLOW. Communication is free and open. Data are available for processing and use by members. Expert resources in and out of the group are used in problem solving or

---

3 An attempt is made in *Participative Action* to spell out in detail the changes that occur on all four dimensions.

action. Conflict is recognized, dealt with, and used in problem solving or creative action. Feedback is used to continually modify goal formation and decision making. People are tolerant of interruptions and deviations. Activities are related to goals or can be made to be so. A person with the data can be heard. Decisions in the group are based upon processed data. Methodological and technological decisions are made by consensus or near-consensus. Decisions can be reversed with focus on new data.

GOAL. When the concerns about purpose and productivity have been appreciably resolved, there is a high degree of goal integration. People who have been able to integrate their many intrinsic goals into a common goal show purposeful, meaningful, and creative work or productivity. Conflict at various levels is minimal. Goals are explicit and verbalized, and they change as the tasks become accomplished. An optimal number of people are interested in the ongoing activity of the group and can change the direction of the group when this no longer becomes the case. The intrinsic goals of individuals are tied in with the goals of the group, or should they cease to be so meshed, the individual is free to leave the group, temporarily or permanently, depending upon the nature of the group role-prescriptions. People are learning, growing, and changing.

CONTROL. Legitimate influence is easily exerted. There is optimal interchangeability of critical roles in the group. The power structure is relatively open and manageable and varies in nature with expertness, the nature of the problem, and the nature of the situation. There is an optimal distribution of member roles at any cross-sectional analysis of group activity. Organization is relatively spontaneous and occurs in response to the needs of the problem. Organization is easily changed. There is maximal flow of communication. Formal channeling is not necessary in problem solving. Control is exerted by the nature of the goal, the intrinsic motivations, and the objectives of the group. There is a participative structure.

Because of the changing nature of the external environment of groups and the demands of new goals as these become differentiated, there is no single readily visible organizational format that is preferable to another. For instance, formal appointment of a leader or recorder makes little difference in the role interdependence called for by the demands of data processing, goal formation, and problem solving. Many organizational functions disappear. Conventional concepts of span of control, channeling of information, and group composition seem to be appropriate to high-defense groups, and less appropriate and perhaps dysfunctional in more mature groups.

Growth of the Person

Implicit in the material already presented is a theory of personality development. The critical dimensions of growth of the personality are assumed to be those identified by the four primary modal concerns. The primary block to continuing personal growth lies in the defense level-in the lack of acceptance by the person of himself and of other persons. Significant progress along each dimension makes possible or directs change in the lower dimensions on the contingency hierarchy.

In building an informal theory of change, we have examined the clinical literature on personality growth, analyzed interviews of individuals undergoing group training, and made logical extrapolations of the processes we noted in training groups. Our four dimensions are a tentative "best fit" of all these observations.

The healthy personality has growing awareness of himself and of his own motivations and can live with this awareness. Just as he accepts himself, it is possible for him to accept others and to trust them. He is able to attain and to accept membership in mature groups. He permits others to deviate from his own attitudes and ideas without strong needs to change them. As a father, teacher, or manager, he is able to be permissive, accepting. He is able to love himself and is free to love others.

The healthy person is able to behave with spontaneity. In doing so, he participates with others in giving and receiving data. The spontaneous person can act interdependently by being an effective participant-observer. He is able to integrate input of data into his actions *as he acts* and to modify his actions with feedback. He maintains his person, with integrity and unity, but communicates openly with others. He expresses feelings, perceptions, and attitudes freely when relevant to the dyadic or group situation to which he gives membership. There is low disparity between his inner thoughts and his verbalized speech. He is able to act spontaneously without undue concern as to how his speech will be heard- without undue concern for his social image. There is high congruity between the self-image and the image others have of him. He can make interpersonal and intrapersonal decisions with relative ease because of the free flow of data relevant to such decisions. He is thus able to live with reality with minimal need to distort reality.

The healthy person has a high degree of integration of needs and actions at all levels of awareness. The multiple aspects of the person are in optimal congruence. He has minimal intrapersonal conflict. He is able to determine his own intrinsic motivations, to create new ones as he grows, and to find a work life and a play life that will maximize his intrinsic growth patterns. He is able to work effectively with others to create group goals that will be actualizing for himself and for the others. Because growth is a process of change, this process of integration or congruity is never static. As the person grows, his intrinsic motivations change. But as they change he is able to attain new memberships and seek new activities, goals, or jobs.

The healthy person can participate with others in solving problems, without an undue expenditure of energy either in depending upon others or in fighting them in context-dependent ways. He imposes his own controls from within with a minimum of external controls. He can live with the authority problem. He works well in joint inquiry and joint problem solving, as well as in independent inquiry. He is flexible in roles he can take. He works well with or without organizational structure.

Persuasive and Participative Models of Action

As has been seen, group formation occurs as a continuing set of solutions to the problems deriving from the four focal concerns of acceptance, data, goal, and control. A person who attains or is given a focal role in the group formation (e.g., father, teacher, manager, or trainer) tends to develop some consistencies in his technology of operation in the group. The "theory" he

uses is based upon some more or less systematic set of attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions about group formation, person formation, and his relationship to such formation. For purposes of our analysis, we have distinguished two clusters of theories about group leadership or management.

One technology, the "persuasive technology," tends to arise predictably and somewhat systematically when a group has failed to make great movements on the acceptance dimension. When the group has made great progress on the acceptance dimension, another technology, the "participative," tends to arise. In practice, of course, fathers, teachers, managers, and trainers tend to exhibit mixed and inconsistent technologies. We are concerned with certain predictions that can be made from such a systematic treatment of leadership technology and have derived a theory of trainer-behavior from this analysis.

As indicated in Tables 3 and 5, the persuasion technology is defined by certain clusters of behavior which arise as resolutions of the focal concern problems. The behavior of the manager is derived from fear, distrust, and lack of confidence in the capacities, attitudes, and maturity of the members of the group. Resolutions of the other three concerns arise out of this distrust and fear. In handling the purpose and productivity concerns, the manager or father tends to use command, persuasion, influence, guidance, or training in an effort to give motivations to members of the group and to influence productivity (learning, work, or growth). Thus educators tend to try to develop appropriate goals in the student and to train students to become creative, to learn, and to be effective according to the preconceived model viewed by the teacher. The parent attempts to get the child to be conscientious, loving, ambitious, or to fit into the culture of the group as the parent sees it. The trainer tends to motivate the group members to look at themselves and to want to change. Under this technology, goal determination and assessment of motivation are usually done by the manager, teacher, or trainer.

Table 3   Early, "Persuasive" Technologies in Groups

Modal Concern	Entry Behavior	Reaction in Group
Acceptance (Membership)	Fear Distrust	Facade building Cynicism, suspicion
Data (Decision)	Strategy Facade	Circumvention Distortion
Goal (Productivity)	Manipulation Persuasion	Apathy, flight Suspicion, cynicism
Control (Organization)	Control Bargaining	Dependency Hostility

Table 4   Later, "Participative" Technologies in Groups

Modal Concern	Entry Behavior	Reaction in Group
Acceptance (Membership)	Confidence Trust	Trust Diversity, exploitation
Data (Decision)	Openness Spontaneity	Feedback, exposure, Consensus potential
Goal (productivity)	Self-assessment Problem solving	Ego strength Creativity
Control (Organization)	Permissiveness Interdependence	Participative form Participative function

Table 5   Reactions to Persuasive Technologies

Modal Concern	Persuasive Mode of Entry	Modal Reactions to Persuasive Technologies (Symptoms of Unresolved Concerns)
Acceptance (Membership)	Fear Distrust	Distrust and accompanying denial Fears of personal inadequacy Legalism; quibbling Resistance to initiation of action Bartering of personalities; "polite" behavior Atrophy of affection Concern over motives Paranoia; suspicion; cynicism Concern over inclusion; protective pairing Controls; reporting requirements Specificity of channeling and structure Conformity; rituals; restriction of range of behavior

Modal Concern	Persuasive Mode of Entry	Modal Reactions to Persuasive Technologies (Symptoms of Unresolved Concerns)
Data (Decision)	Strategy Secrecy Communication downward	Ambiguity; maximization of projection
		Strategy; gimmicks, tricks
		Fear of the unknown
		Facade building; secrecy
		Distortion of data through channels
		Caution; pretense; protective phraseology
		False assumptions; inadequate theory
		Extremes in slow or rapid decision making
		Circumvention; grapevine behavior
		Deceit; dishonesty; intrapersonal disparities
		Increased communication downward, with screening
		Rise of suppression skills
Goal (Productivity)	Manipulation of extrinsic motivations	Apathy, flight; withdrawal
		Resistance, passive or active
		Increased use of extrinsic rewards
		Increased approval and status needs
		Low commitment; overestimation
		Extreme of frenetic or apathetic work
		Persuasion; advice; "helping" or changing others
		Manipulation; coercion
		Competition; rivalry; jealousy; favoritism
		Need for structure or personal leaders
		Displaced feelings of responsibility
		Atrophy of self; loss of identity; stereotypy
		Interpersonal conflict
		"Pumping" of motivation by interpersonal conflict
Control (Organization)	High control Persuasion Guidance	Chaos; disorganization; cynicism about control
		Dependency; regressive behavior
		Counterdependency; resistance to control
		Hostility, often latent or consciously masked
		Power struggles; fight; symbolic fight; debate
		Bargaining; limited war
		Status and power concerns
		Formalization of rules and structure
		Concerns about leadership
		Formal job prescriptions, organizational positioning
		Allocation of work through power or barter

Table 6   Reactions to Participative Technologies

Modal Concern	Participative Mode of Entry	Modal Reactions to Participative Technologies (Symptoms of Resolved Concerns)
Acceptance (Membership)	Confidence Trust	Trust and acceptance of distrust Greater feeling of personal adequacy Acceptance of legitimate influence Positive affect toward members Diversity and nonconformity Acceptance of motives of others Easy expression of feeling and conflict Facade reduction Acceptance of idiosyncratic behavior Controls over processes, not people
Data (Decision)	Openness Spontaneity Communication, all directions	Clarity; minimization of defense Problem-solving behavior Trust; reduction of suspicion Increased feedback upward Freedom of movement outside channels Reduction of intrapersonal disparities Open expression of feeling and conflict Increased permeability of boundaries Facade reduction
Goal (Productivity)	Problem solving Freedom for self- assessment	Work orientation Visibility of intrinsic motivations Reduction of competitive behavior Reduction of conflict Creativity in sustained work Increased involvement in tasks Reduction of apathy Reduced need for work structure Diversity of behavior and attitude Increasing congruence between work and play Reduced potency of extrinsic rewards Nonconformity High personal identity; ego strength
Control (Organization)	Permissiveness Interdependence Freedom of form	Interdependence Diversity and nonconformity Fluidity of organization Greater unpredictably of behavior Reduced latent hostility Allocation of work by consensus or ability Reduction of symbolic fight Open expression of feeling and conflict Informality Spontaneity of form Reduced concern over organization form

In handling the data-flow concerns, the persuasion technologist is likely to use a "strategy" of some kind. He tends to make decisions about and to control the data output or input within the system. He tends to use various strategies in order to make decisions palatable or understood. He may initiate a great deal of clear communication downward in order to be sure that the policies of management, the teaching aims, or the trainer philosophy is clear to the members. of the group. Under stress this technician will become more secretive. More planning will be done in private before working with the group.

The persuasion technologist uses varying degrees of control from the top in handling the organizational problem of the group. The father, teacher, or trainer acts in such a way as to maintain the dependency of the members. Under crisis the organization tends to become more formal. Lines of authority become more clear. Channels are specified. Job prescriptions and role specifications become increasingly formalized. Control of organizational functions is maintained by the leader. This process becomes more formalized with crisis and becomes modified greatly in the flow of everyday work. The control becomes more hidden and subtle and may become more palatable as things go more smoothly in the group.

In contrast with this persuasion technology is a "participative" technology, which is defined by the resolution of the four focal concern problems that are listed in Table 6. With personal growth and group growth come greater trust and respect in the group relationship—greater acceptance of self and others within the group. This trust and acceptance tend to be accompanied by another cluster of behaviors in response to movement on the other three dimensions. In the extreme manifestation of this theory, individuals in the group are allowed great freedom to assess their own goals, determine their own intrinsic motivations, and decide their own directions for learning, productivity, and creativity.

The participative technologist tends to develop open and free communication and decision making. In the extreme instance, all planning is done in or in front of the group. The group itself makes all decisions. A maximum of communication of feelings and perceptions goes through the system on all matters relevant to group locomotion and progress. The leader encourages spontaneous action, expresses his own feelings and perceptions easily, and acts in such a way as to permit optimal flow of data within the system. Interdependence is achieved through interaction in high acceptance, intrinsic goal formation, and maximum freedom of data processing. The organization becomes as free and as informal as trust, size, and other relevant factors permit. Formalities of communication systems and of inter-role responsibility systems are determined by needs of coordination and data-flow rather than by needs for control, distrust, power, or strategy.

These two ideal models are logical constructions which are derived from experiment and empirical observation, followed by logical extrapolations of what seem to be the relevant dimensions in group and personal development. The relevant and critical dimensions of personal growth seem to be acceptance, spontaneity, integration, and interdependence. The relevant dimensions of growth of groups seem to be in the direction of supportive climate, reality communication and feed-back, maximal goal integration, and functional interdependence in action and structure.

The T-Group Trainer

The theory of T-Group behavior that we are proposing is that the trainer approximate the participative technology as closely as it is possible for him to do at whatever state of personal growth he has achieved along the four basic dimensions of growth. In a sense, then, the trainer who wishes to be maximally helpful should be as trusting, as open, as permissive, and as interdependent as he is able to be. Each trainer will have a band-of-experimentation area in which he is making provisional attempts to adapt his own behavior to his intrinsic need system. Experimentation in an atmosphere of some degree of trust and warmth, with process orientation, allows the trainer, within his own limitations of growth, to become progressively more trusting, open, permissive, and interdependent.

The trainer's permissiveness and trust are tested in situations of crisis: a severe emotional breakdown; a bitterly hostile, personal attack by one member or another; prolonged periods when the group seems to be working on something that the trainer does not feel leads to learning; or strong dependence demands for the leader to solve the problem. for the group. The taped analysis of the training behavior of a number of T-Group trainers indicates that, irrespective of the verbalized philosophy of the trainer, trainers differ greatly in their behavior under such crisis. Some trainers jump in readily to protect weak members, caution the group about dangers ahead, and exhibit many aspects of persuasive technology. There are strong reality-based factors which determine fears and distrusts, but, in general, there is a tendency for experienced trainers to become more trusting, accepting, permissive, open, and freedom giving. Each trainer must evaluate the forces in the situation as best he can and behave as consistently as he can with the theory that he is evolving.

Our many years of experience with "leaderless" groups in various settings lead us to feel that maximum participative behavior is attained more readily in training groups without trainers than with trainers. The groups are perhaps more aptly described as "1eaderful," in that what occurs is not an abolition of leadership but a distribution of leadership roles in the group. It is perhaps even more accurate to describe the participative groups as "trainerless." Members learn to observe and to experiment upon their own behavior in increasingly creative ways. They learn that it is less adaptive to take a "trainer stance," that is, to advise, "help," teach, change, or persuade others. As one member put it: "I found that I came here to teach the others, and I learned to try to learn rather than to teach."

Trainerless groups are optimally effective when significant norm-inducing activities occur in the total training community that produce a participative and supportive climate for provisional learning. As the educational literature indicates, trainerless groups in other educational climates are often notably unsuccessful.

The evidence that trainerless groups, under certain conditions, produce notable change in the participants does not necessarily constitute evidence that a persuasion technology cannot be made to work as effectively as a participative technology. There are other, less direct, indications that a persuasion technology is not so effective. One of the assumptions of the theory is that there is maximal congruence between participative technology and personal growth. The technologist also grows maximally under this kind of technology. The persuasion technologist not only inhibits the growth of others hut inhibits his own growth along the four dimensions cited above.

Trainer Behavior and Concern-Reduction

The theory presented in this paper has been used in a variety of settings: classrooms, industrial groups, community groups, and T Groups of various kinds. The relevance of the theory to T Groups was tested by analyzing sequential trends in T Groups conducted in various settings by a variety of trainers with different training styles. Various kinds of data were obtained from samplings of tapes or coded observations of 114 T Groups in which one or more trainers were present and active. Forty-nine of these groups were observed at various laboratories conducted by the National Training Laboratories; 43 in various industrial settings; 22 student and adult groups in the University of Colorado studies. Data from these trainer groups were compared with similar kinds of data obtained at the University of Colorado on 66 groups in which trainers were not present.[4]

The evidence is abundantly clear from these studies that, whether or not a trainer is present, groups work on the four primary modal concerns and the four derivative modal concerns listed in Table 1. The analysis of the trainer-group tapes indicates that some trainer behaviors are associated with group growth and personal learning and that some behaviors are associated with apparent reduction of such growth and learning. Because of the inadequacy of our measurements, it is not possible at this point to specify all of the helpful behaviors, but it is possible to draw some guide lines and to make suggestions to T-Group trainers. T-Group trainers can become problems in themselves just as can other members. Inexpert trainers do little harm and often are useful sources of data, because groups learn to handle such problems as they handle other member-problems. The suggestions that follow have been helpful in the training of T-Group trainers in industry and in student leadership training.

Building Acceptance. There are many evidences of fear and distrust that may appear in the trainer's attitudes and behaviors: feelings that he can let the group go only so far in chaos before he "bails them out"; feelings that his role is to protect the weaker members who might become hurt in the interaction; feelings that he is irreplaceable—that, without him, members would remain involved in unproductive "content" discussion or get into damaging therapeutic areas; feelings that only qualified professionals may become trainers; or feelings that he must set up a strategy or training plan before the group meets in order to guarantee group progress or individual learning. As with all fears and distrusts, these trainer concerns have bases in relative degrees of reality. With experience in T Groups, with greater acceptance of himself and others, the trainer can learn to reduce these fears and distrusts to a minimum.

Each person is limited by his own acquired and changing trust boundary. The trainer learns to be as trusting and loving as he can be—as accepting as his level of personal growth permits. He must learn how trusting he is able to be in all groups and in each special group. As

---

4 Sixty-six of the eighty-eight T Groups used in the University of Colorado studies were "leaderless" in the sense that no leader or trainer was present in the groups. Between the years 1949 and 1956 various kinds of data were gathered on 1,144 students and adult members of these trainerless groups. The analysis of the data was financed by the Group Psychology Branch of the Office of Naval Research, and the research is reported in Jack R. Gibb, "Effects of Norm-Centered Training Upon Individual and Institutional Behavior." Mimeographed paper presented at the American Psychological Association annual meetings, September 1, 1958.

he becomes more trusting, he can free himself to become more spontaneous, more interdependent, and more freedom-giving. A training tool that we have found helpful is to suggest that the trainer imagine, in any conversation that he has with any group member or with another trainer, that the conversation is being taped for eventual playback to the group in question. When he first attempts this, he will find that his spontaneous comments are filled with evidences of his own distrust. Particularly prevalent in the talk of beginning trainers are remarks derogating the abilities and attitudes of group members, humor directed at ineptness of members, and clinical or personal analysis of the latent motivational structure of members. As the trainer begins to process these data about his own sell-acceptance, he is working on his own personal growth. As he becomes more accepting, he is better able to behave spontaneously in a way that would allow his taped conversations to be fed back to the group. He can learn to be trusting, spontaneous, open, and interdependent with the T Group.

In our seven-year span of experimentation with leaderless groups at the University of Colorado, we were initially highly concerned about the effects of allowing a class of 60 college students to work in T Groups with no trainers, supervision, faculty controls, or standard curriculum, and we were especially concerned about all the forces of faculty and administrative disapproval of such a process. We therefore built in some controls on attendance, gave weekly demonstrations of training methods, and specified numerous data-gathering instruments (questionnaires, reaction sheets, observer forms) that groups were required to fill out before, during, or after each group session. The staff tabulated and fed these data back to the groups on the day following data collection. As we became less fearful and more trusting, we gradually experimented with reduced controls. We found that groups tended to take over direction of their own processes and to move more quickly along the dimensions of growth when given greatest freedom and least prescribed structure. Groups built their own attendance norms and reduced absence to nearly zero as they arrived at group generated goals. Groups found they needed data. and constructed their own instruments, which were in many cases more imaginative and certainly more relevant to emergent daily concerns than were the instruments provided by the staff in earlier years. Groups organized for work built internal and distributive leadership structure and worked with interpersonal data that were more significant and at greater depth than those dealt with in conventional trainer groups.

This experimentation led us to develop a great deal of confidence and trust in the abilities of a group of people to handle their own process problems in a significant way when given support and freedom. In other words, through experimentation we learned along the same modal dimensions as did group members. As we became more clear as to our own intrinsic motivations, our own purposes became clear to the group. Groups learned to trust staff aims. Greater productivity occurred in terms of learning outcomes. A continuing series of experiments, financed by the ONR grant through the seven years, indicated clearly that groups in later years made significantly greater gains in learnings than did groups in earlier years. Group members learned, for example, that staff motivations were not to change them but to allow them to create the conditions under which they might make their own decisions about change. Our intrinsic motivations changed as we learned more about the processes of learning and growth. With

greater trust, we were then able to try trainerless groups in community and industrial settings, with even greater success in terms of measurable learning outcomes.

Working on the Membership Concern. The problem of membership for the trainer is similar in kind to the problem of membership for other group members. Differential expectations and role demands make the trainer a special person at the beginning of training. Members have special concerns about his omnipotence, his manipulativeness, and his wishes. The trainer can be helpful if he offers to the group, for data processing, his perceptions and feelings about his membership. His own self-role prescriptions increase his membership problems. As he learns skills and attitudes appropriate to interdependency he can work more effectively with the group in resolving membership concerns.

Data Processing and Decision Making. Groups find early that available data are inadequate for decision making and group movement. In the process of concern-reduction, group members devise procedures of various sorts to facilitate the processing of data present in the group. The Colorado experiments show clearly that groups can initiate highly adequate data-processing procedures without the help of skilled social scientists as trainers and that they also can learn effective use of technical help from professionals.

One helpful trainer entry on this dimension is for him to share his feelings and perceptions with the group and thus to participate in resolution of the data problem. Being open and spontaneous is perhaps the most difficult problem for the inexpert trainer. Because of the role-perceptions and role-expectations built in for the classic T Group trainer, the inexpert trainer may become a data artifact. Group members may see him as knowing the answers, but as unwilling to share his answers with them; as knowing the solutions to the concern-resolutions, but as standing aloof from the group; as allowing them to find out for themselves, because it is somehow best for them to "learn it on their own." The common feeling among members that "there is no need asking the trainer, because he won't tell us anyway" is an example of an artifactitious data problem.

One rule of thumb for the trainer is that he should be as open *as it is possible for him to be* in the data processing and decision making of the group.

Creating Goals. One of the blocks to handling the purpose problem is the difficulty in determining the intrinsic motivations of group members. As the trainer explores his own purposes in being in the group and his own model of what a group might be, he serves as a model of one possible way of arriving at goal clarity. He should avoid setting up his behavior as *the* model.

Productivity. Growth and learning come to be accepted as the verbalized goals and the work tasks of most T Groups. Most groups start with an underlying assumption that people learn by talking and thus that the primary problem to be solved is to find a discussion topic, preferably one about which there will be lively argument. As the group explores this problem under process concern, it finds that other "theories" will lead to greater productivity. As trust and acceptance grow in the group, the group is better able to use the significant

methodological resources of the trainer in this area of growth. Then the trainer, as he becomes more comfortable in the group and with himself, is better able to exhibit in his actions his own theory of learning. As the group works through its many concerns, it becomes better able to accept any member of the group, including the trainer, as a methodological or content resource.

At one level, the activities of the T Group may be seen as a series of work cycles. Each cycle will consist of the following sequences: planning => acting-observing => process analysis => generalization. Early in group life these sequences are barely discernible. Planning may not exist at the verbal level. Acting (conversation, agenda setting, role playing) may be random and unorganized. Process observing and analysis may be sporadic and casual and often will depend upon trainer-interventions, if a trainer is present. In trainerless groups, members tend to initiate process interventions earlier. Generalization is often private, informal, or truncated.

As the group evolves, each of these phases of the sequence becomes better organized, more under group control, more part of the formal agenda.

Trainer behavior may be differentiated, in part, by the degree to which each trainer directly intervenes at each of these phases. One trainer intervenes only at the process analysis phase; in this way he exerts control only indirectly upon the other three phases. Another acts as a consultant to the group in the formal "planning" phase, the setting up of systematic observing techniques, and at the process analysis phase. Another may directly intervene in all four phases.

It is clear that the trainer may contribute to learnings in the T Group from a great variety of roles. Often the trainer's powerful influence in early stages of groupship arises from his deliberate role restriction, although his effectiveness will depend upon factors other than the degree of such restriction. He will operate to maximal effectiveness if he operates at all stages of the work cycle. This style of training introduces some complications, however. The more complex the role of the trainer, the greater the difficulty in communicating the role to the group and the less his initial power.

Particularly at the planning and generalization stages, there is danger that the trainer, because he was introduced to the group in a special status role, might easily be trapped into supplying functions usually supplied by a discussion leader or teacher, with a resultant increase in dependency. The trainer has several options. He may withdraw from the group completely—a behavior pattern which induces the frustrations and tensions accompanying ambiguity and lack of satisfactory work organization. At a later stage he may use this withdrawal state as profitable material for process analysis. He may choose an opposite alternative of entering the group as a member. However, such behavior greatly weakens subsequent interventions and deprives the group of the dramatic effect of trainer-interventions which come from the trainer-as-process-analyst-only role.

One successful pattern is to enter into the planning in the very early stages at enough points to help the group set up useful training plans, to play an observer role during the "acting-observing" stage of the work cycle, to contribute to the process analysis, and to stay out of the generalization stages until the group has attained sufficient maturity to handle participation of the trainer at the content level.

The reactivation of dependency feelings produced by member-trainer interaction makes it extremely difficult for the trainer to participate effectively in the productivity dimension. He can learn to act as a methodological resource and to communicate his skills and resources in this area where his contributions may loom large.

Control. As the trainer grows, he is able to act more interdependently and to limit the amount of group behavior that he needs to control. It is particularly important that he understand his own dependency needs and the effects of these needs upon the groups with which he works and that he be able to discuss his own behavior rather freely with the group. Otherwise, he intrudes too many of his own needs into the dependency resolution. It is our impression, based on the Colorado data, that understandings of dependency processes are greater where members work them out in relation to emergent group leaders rather than in relation to appointed trainers.

Building an Organization. Growth on this dimension consists of a series of miniature experiments in forming a social organism. The trainer can participate in this organization building by interpreting and describing the organizational norms, by helping to analyze the experiments performed by the group, by participating in the analysis of the informal data that are produced, and by calling attention to the organizational functions of his own artifactitious role.

Provisionalism. Growth as a trainer is an experimental quest for increasingly adequate personal resolutions of the four modal concerns. The trainer makes continuing provisional attempts to relate to the group in a way that will lead to concern-resolution, group growth, personal growth, and defense-reduction. Trainer needs will influence trainer style. If the trainer's group behavior is consonant with his articulated training philosophy and he can talk about occasional dissonance when it occurs, he is in a position to contribute his behavior as data for group learning.

Norm Centering. The primary methodological contribution that the trainer can make to the group is continually to express the norms of the group as he sees them. Each group member can learn to reproduce to some degree, in other groups of which he is a part, the concern-resolutions that occur in his training group. He learns, to some degree, to participate with others in creating a defense-reductive climate, goal integration, functional feedback, and creative interdependence. He learns to become aware of the processes of personal and group growth. He learns how to create the interpersonal situations which will help him to accept himself and others and to have others accept him—to grow and to help others to grow. It is not sufficient that he experience these processes in an intuitive way— "something exciting happened, but I'm not sure what" —but that he be able to talk about the phenomena and the technologies that have produced them.

To share in the stating of norms is a primary medium for such learning. Any member of the group can participate in such verbalization. From one point of view, the most adaptive work of the learning group is the diagnosis and articulation of what is going on in the here-and-now. As people become increasingly aware of the many facets of what is happening, they can exert more influence upon the growth process.

Following is a selected list of central norm areas that concern groups as they consciously attend to their own processes.

RISK. The group develops more or less consistent ways of limiting risk, handling fears, testing level of risk, punishing or rewarding risk takers, or handling those who either expose too much or fail to share in what are seen as the common dangers.

TRUST. The group develops more or less stable trust levels. It develops norms about communicating trust, handling members who deviate from trust boundaries, viewing suspicions about motivations of trainers and other members, influencing what is said about the group outside the group, and building trust.

NONCONFORMITY. The group develops ways of handling members who deviate in attitude or behavior, of expressing differential tolerance for special areas of conformity and nonconformity, and of communicating rewards and punishments both for conformity and for nonconformity.

MEMBERSHIP. Norms emerge about the privileges of membership, the ways of attaining membership, the degrees and levels of membership, the importance of commitment, and the expression of acceptance, affection, or approval.

REJECTION. More or less consistent patterns arise in the manner of expressing rejection, ways of camouflaging rejection or disapproval, what rejectees may do, and what kinds of behavior will elicit rejection.

FEEDBACK. In working through the data-processing concerns, groups learn ways of giving feedback, receiving feedback, determining limits of feedback, determining who can give such data to whom, ignoring demands for feedback, and acceptable ways of reacting to such data.

CONSENSUS. Norms arise as to what is meant by full or partial agreement, whether silence means assent, dissent, or indecision, how much in agreement a person must feel in order to say he agrees, how decisions are made, how decisions are ignored, and how consensus is tested.

PROCESS. Groups develop more or less consistent habits about what kinds of process to look at, ways of looking at process, how it is integrated into action, how often it is looked at, and who is allowed to make process interventions under what conditions.

DIAGNOSIS. Habits develop around how diagnosis is integrated into action, how much moralizing or evaluation is allowed, how often and under what conditions diagnoses are made, and how diagnosticians are given approval or disapproval.

FEELING-PERCEPTION. Groups develop strong standards about whether feelings should be admitted as data, how often and by whom feelings and perceptions may be expressed, what kinds of feelings and perceptions are admissible in verbal interaction and what kinds admissible only as nonverbal data, and how significant such data are in making what kinds of decisions.

GOAL DETERMINATION. In working through goal-formation concerns, groups develop norms about how goals are formulated, what bearing goals have upon subsequent activity, what is done about goal diversity and incompatibility, and how explicit goals must be in order to create movement.

REWARD-PUNISHMENT. Norms emerge around how punishments and rewards are administered, what kinds of punishments and rewards are appropriate in the group, who can give what kinds of approval or disapproval, and how members should react to differential treatment.

LEARNING-GROWTH. Particularly significant in the T Group, but also present in action groups, are norms about how we learn, what things are seen as evidences of growth, what are acceptable ways of initiating and reacting to change, what effects conflict and exposure have in learning, from whom members are willing to learn, and how members who learn or do not learn are handled.

PROVISIONAL TRY. Consistent patterns emerge concerning how experimentation is carried on by individuals or by the group as a whole, to what degree decisions of the group are provisional or immutable, how formal and deliberate experimentation may be, how to punish and reward innovators, and in what areas of group life provisional behavior is sanctioned.

WORK. Consistent ideas and behavior emerge around the nature of work and play, how work is avoided or accomplished, what constitutes efficiency and how important it is, and what kinds of activities are treated as productive or nonproductive.

CONFLICT. In resolving control concerns, groups soon meet conflict and develop characteristic ways of determining how to handle it, how to produce what kinds of conflict, how to integrate it into work and creativity or how to avoid and repress it, and how to live with different reactions to conflict among members of the group.

PERMISSIVENESS. Norms emerge about how to give or refuse permission or sanction for what kinds of behavior or attitudes, how to handle variable reactions to existing boundaries, how to communicate the permissiveness that does exist, and how to allow and to live with freedoms that emerge.

BOUNDARIES. Groups develop boundaries of various kinds and develop norms about how boundaries arise, how they are violated, how permeable they are, how they are changed, how they are tested, and who is allowed to violate them under what conditions.

RESOURCES. Norms arise regarding the use of people resources in the group-who are permitted to serve as resources or to give information about what, how emergent experts are ignored or used, how much information of what kind a person is allowed to give how often, and what kinds of resource information are seen as special or professional.

ORGANIZATION. Groups learn ways of organizing for action, what kinds of leadership roles are needed from whom, what kinds of organization will be tolerated, how organization can be changed, and how permanent or stable organization must be for what purposes.

Growth Is a Learning Process. Growth is a process of learning. A person can change the significant aspects of his personality and his behavior. Any person can become appreciably more creative and productive than he is at anyone given point. The process of learning is a continuing, open-ended one. People do not necessarily learn by doing but may learn through experience under certain conditions. People generalize learnings from the T Group when they can understand the processes that are happening on the four dimensions of

growth, can verbalize and generalize about these processes, and can perceive their own roles and the roles of others in the development. Learnings are most effective when induced by intrinsic reward systems, when there is an appropriate degree of self-trust and acceptance, when there is spontaneous interplay of perceptual and feeling data, and when the person has a maximum of control over his own participation in the learning process.