

Sensitivity training or laboratory methodology in Western Europe

Dit artikel was bedoeld voor een boek onder redactie van Sidney Mailick met de titel *Newer techniques on training* dat gepubliceerd zou worden in 1970, maar daarvan is het niet gekomen. Het is geschreven in 1969. Vansina beschrijft hoe Europa kennismaakte met T-groepen en vergelijkt de Amerikaanse en de Europese benadering. Ook schetst hij de filosofie en activiteiten van het European Institute for Transnational Studies in Groups and Organizations, dat hij samen met collega's oprichtte om Europese groepstrainers verder te ontwikkelen. Het geeft een goed beeld van hoe organisatiepsychologen destijds dachten over het leren over groepsdynamiek.

Door Leopold Vansina

In preparation of this chapter on laboratory methodology we reviewed a variety of publications on its development, on theory and research about sensitivity training, and on specific, non-confidential projects. Besides the literature, we consulted a few key figures in this field to complete or check our own experiences and recollections. Nevertheless, some interesting work, some professionals or institutes may not appear in the text. Indeed, we did not always have access to private reports or unpublished experiences, nor did we conceive it as essential to the purpose of this chapter, to provide an exhaustive review of all the work, all the professionals and institutes active in sensitivity training. In this chapter we discuss: (1) the introduction and the diffusion of sensitivity training, (2) fields of application of the laboratory approach, (3) some observable differences between sensitivity training in Europe and in the U.S.A., (4) present concerns and plans for the future.

Introduction and diffusion

The way in which laboratory methodology found a place in the European training scene, is a study on its own. Such a study on the diffusion of innovations in training, would have to cope with all the difficulties of tracing

back an innovation to: (a) the distributor(s) of the new training approach or the decision-makers behind them; (b) the first implementor(s), or the first application of sensitivity training; (c) the social scientists or institutions who developed the methodology.

All definitions of sensitivity training use the hic et nunc experiences as the basis for learning

One is immediately confronted with the lack of a clear definition of sensitivity training. Indeed, in this training methodology one can have about as many definitions as there are trainers. All of them, however, have one thing in common, namely, that they use the *hic et nunc* experiences as the basis for learning. I like, therefore, to define sensitivity training as a *training* method which uses the *group* to help individuals learn from their *hic et nunc* experiences. It implies 'behavior' → 'feedback' → 'experimenting with new behavior or change' → 'feedback' → 'integration of the new behavior' or further 'experimentation' until one achieves satisfactory results. Accepting this definition we can now turn to the introduction and diffusion of sensitivity training in Europe. For reasons of clarity, we will take an historical standpoint in our discussions of: the innovative sources of laboratory methodology in Western-Europe, and, the diffusion of the laboratory methodology.

The innovative sources of laboratory methodology in Western-Europe

Independent of the creative work of

K. Lewin and his team in the Connecticut Interracial Commission, 1946 (Lippitt, 1949), a British psychoanalyst, W.R. Bion, started with some experience-based group-work in the Royal Army Medical Corps, which eventually lead to a theory of group dynamics which he described in 'The Leaderless Group Project', in the *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic* (1946) and to the publication of a series of articles in the journal *Human Relations* (Bion, 1959). His therapeutic group work approach was rapidly recognized and used as a new training method by the Tavistock Institute in London, which organized, in collaboration with the University of Leicester, its first residential conference with 'study groups' in Leicester 1957 (Trist & Sofer, 1959). The partners benefited from the advice of H. Coffey, University of California (Berkeley) who had been involved in the work of N.T.L. and who now drew from his experience for the planning of the conference.

These conferences were mostly attended by industrial managers, prison wards, educational people and social workers. Although continental European social scientists, Dr. J. de Koek van Leeuwen, M. Schröder and myself, participated in this program, the typical Tavistock- (Bion-) approach remained confined to the U.K. till 1963.

In Europe, the teaching innovation was not developed in a *university* setting, but in the *army*. The key figure, W. Bion, was a practitioner who did not have any formal relations with the world of the universities. Neither did the Tavistock Institute which applied the 'study groups' to people in leadership positions. It gives us something to think about in terms of what institutional settings allow for innovative work!

The diffusion of the laboratory methodology

After World War Two, various institutions were set up to help Europe recover from its destruction and to catch up with the economic and scientific development in the U.S.A. One of these, the European Productivity Agency in Paris, made it possible for quite a few social scientists to visit and/or to study at various American universities and institutions. Consequently, during the fifties, various social scientists returned to Europe having had some exposure to the new training technique. Among the many social scientists were: Claude Faucheux, Max and Robert Pagès, Mme Schutzenberger (France); Charles Mertens de Wilmars and myself (Belgium); Jan Bout, Jan Clee, Ella Goubitz, B. Lievegoed, J. Koekebakker and Marjan Schröder (the latter returned in 1960) (Netherlands); Traugott Lindner (Austria); Arne Ebeltoft, Gunnar Hjelholt and Svein Kile (Scandinavia), who upon their return applied some of their learnings in a more or less modified form.

In the meantime – or in some instances proceeding these visits to Bethel, Maine – Leland Bradford (and his team) came over to demonstrate the new technique in Europe (1954 and 1955). His visit was followed by another in 1956, this time lead by H. Leavitt, D. Nylen and H. Thelen. These first experiments, often conceived by the European as a pure American technique, were not always liked by the local participants. Consequently, a strong rejective attitude towards 'T-groups' was aroused, especially by the union leaders who had taken part in those early labs. The European social scientists were generally speaking more careful. Some of the laboratory principles were being used in newly conceived structured training devices

(Kraak, 1960). Training in social skills, in conference leading, and in interviewing became some of the more controlled and less unstructured forms of sensitivity training. Others started experimenting with the T-group and gradually developed their own approach. Such conferences were locally organized without much collaboration between trainers from various institutions and countries (Pagès, 1959).

Two factors in the early sixties stimulated the development of a European association of sensitivity trainers. Firstly, more American social scientists decided to spend their sabbatical leave in Europe or visited our continent for shorter periods. These visits of W. Bennis, L. Bradford, Ch. Ferguson and M. Miles brought various sensitivity trainers geographically together and stimulated interest in collaboration. Secondly, the European Association of Management Training Centres, helped Dr. Ch. Mertens de Wilmars organize four international seminars in group dynamics. These seminars, three of which were held in Belgium and one in the U.K., brought together an international staff of sensitivity trainers.

A meeting in Noordwijk aan Zee in 1963 was attended by most of the European sensitivity trainers

The informal exchanges of theoretical considerations and experiences, became a most rewarding by-product of the conference work. All these events had generated enough interest by the professionals to organize a meeting in Noordwijk aan Zee, Holland, 1963,

which was attended by most of the European sensitivity trainers and a few Americans e.g. L. Bradford and Don Nylen. Local and national preoccupation, however, were still too important to develop something more solid than a forum – or a platform to get to know one another professionally – and a commitment to meet again.

In the next meeting in Royaumont near Paris in 1964, besides the discussions of two papers, most energy and time was invested in clearing the local and national interest-barriers for an international professional organization. The outcome was agreement. A blueprint of the European Institute for Transnational Studies in Group- and Organizational Development, from then onward called E.I.T., was developed. Its aims and mission were written down in a constitution which read as follows: 'To bring into being a transnational body of professionals in the social sciences under conditions which will foster the development of a distinctive competence in the undertaking of research, training and consulting activities concerning intergroup and cross-cultural phenomena and problems arising in transnational organizations and environments.'

The Executive Committee, elected for three years, consisted of Mr. Gunnar Hjelholt, Secretary General, Mr. Eric Trist, Treasurer (later succeeded in this role by Dr. Traugott Lindner), and Dr. Leopold Vansina, Chairman of the Membership and Standards Committee. The present Executive Committee has Dr. T. Lindner as Secretary General, Mr. Trygve Johnstad, Treasurer and Dr. L. Vansina, Chairman of the Membership and Standards Committee.

E.I.T. is – as can be seen from its mission – not only a professional organization of sensi-

tivity trainers, but wants to develop international relations and organizations through various types of activities and methods among which laboratory methodology holds the most important place. As an institute, E.I.T., has been involved or is still active in the following areas: (a) Action research projects, for example: the building of an international industrial research organization, and the integration of fishermen in the harbours and home communities. (b) Training of managers in understanding international organizations and international relations. Such activities are carried out within large organizations or in public conferences organized for such purposes. Two such conferences per year are jointly conducted by E.I.T. and N.T.L. Staff. (c) Training of organizational change agents and sensitivity trainers. Most E.I.T. members, besides being involved in these centrally organized activities, continue to direct sensitivity programs, research and social change projects from their own local centers or universities.

Looking at the membership body of E.I.T., in 1970 one notices that 42,5% of the members are full-time professors, while another 15% of the members hold teaching assignments at a university. 42,5% are directors or key members in consulting, training or research centers. In 1965, however, more than 60% of the membership body had no formal relationship with universities. Since then, several members have gained acceptance in the university circles, while quite a few individuals left the university institutes for more independent work. Since the turnover in membership as well as the newer membership body does not indicate that more academicians leave or join E.I.T., one may find in these percentages a slight indication

Area	Number of members	Population in millions
Northern Europe		
Belgium	2	9.3
Denmark	4	4.7
Holland	3	12.0
Norway	4	3.7
Sweden	0	7.6
U.K.	10	53.0
Central Europe		
Austria	1	7.2
France	4	48.0
Germany	4	58.0
Switzerland	0	5.8
Southern Europe		
Italy	2	52.0
Portugal	0	9.1
Spain	1	31.5
U.S.A.	12	192.0

Tabel 1: E.I.T membership 1970

that the laboratory methodology is gaining acceptance in the academic world. The present membership body has a strong representation of the U.K. and the U.S.A. (see Table 1) and a very weak one from Italy and Spain. If one divides Western-Europe into three geographical spheres: the Northern, the Central and the Southern part – thereby assuming that the E.I.T. membership is fairly representative of the sensitivity training movement in Europe – one is struck by the fact that this training approach declines in strength the further south one goes. The ratio of E.I.T. members to the population is in Northern Europe 1:13.2 million and in Southern Europe it goes down to 1:30.8 million. I would like to see some research done on

the relationship between sensitivity training and economic development. It may well be that industrial societies have a greater need for improving human relations; or that they have the means to systematically focus on group- and interpersonal relations. Besides E.I.T., other smaller organizations and lone individuals, who do not meet the professional standards and ethics set by E.I.T. or who prefer to operate locally or outside the E.I.T. Institute are now involved in sensitivity training of one kind or another. In this respect, the work of the Netherlands' Institute of Preventive Medicine should be mentioned (de Kock van Leeuwen, Schröder & van der Vegt, 1964; de Kock van Leeuwen & van Ravenzwaaij, 1968). The latter institute

provided the necessary institutional backing for further development of sensitivity training in The Netherlands. Their efforts resulted in a sizable professional association of Dutch trainers, T.S.R. (Trainers in Social Relations). In France, one has to mention the work of Max Pagès and J. Ardoine, in their respective institutes A.R.I.P. (Association pour la Recherche et l'Intervention Psychosociologique) and A.N.D.S.H.A. (Association Nationale pour le Développement des Sciences Humaines Appliquées). In the U.K., The Tavistock Institute continues its early work; while the department of Management Studies, University of Leeds, in close collaboration with American trainers, regularly organizes management programs based on training-groups.

Summary. In 1964, one succeeded in building a European Institute, similar to N.T.L.'s Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, which groups together the key persons in this field. E.I.T. has become the basis for international work, professional exchange and the development of sensitivity trainers. Their members continue to direct from their local centers and institutes, i.e. research and action programs in the field of sensitivity training. In addition to this international institute, a number of smaller, national organizations and individuals organize these types of training programs.

Field of application

Originally, sensitivity training was introduced in various *management or leadership conferences* as a new method to teach human relations, group dynamics and even leadership skills. The T-group was the basic element in the program around which lectures, role

playing and other exercises were woven. Later on, intergroup relations (Bridger, 1965; Higgin & Bridger, 1965) were introduced and the learning experience became widened to include the study of the total seminar as a community or mini-society (the administration of the conference included) cfr. G. Hjelholt's conferences in Scandinavia, and the study of the organizing processes within the conference (Lindner, 1968). Although the place of sensitivity training in management courses is still debated by a number of social scientists (Pugh, 1965), its role is becoming more and more important. Since 1963, attempts have been made to use

*The human being seems
to be extremely sensitive
to expose his cultural or
national feelings*

the laboratory methodology to gain understanding and to develop better international or intercultural relations. Although one has learned much about designs and group composition that facilitate or hinder understanding of intercultural work, these types of programs are not very successful on the market. On the one hand the human being seems to be extremely sensitive to expose his cultural or national feelings and to learn from them; on the other hand, the temporary system – in casu conferences – foster the development of an 'international' spirit, which in turn facilitates the temporary denial of cultural values and sense of belonging. Furthermore, cultural or national stereotypes are often masked by interpersonal and intergroup animosities

which seem to be much easier to focus on. The training group programs for managers (mostly aiming at industrial organizations) have, with a few exceptions, been organized as 'stranger conferences' attended by individuals from different companies and countries. The participant body is generally composed of higher, middle management and senior managers, heads of staff or administrators. I know of only a few industrial organizations in Europe that have sensitivity training within their companies: A Danish shipping company (Hjelholt, 1963), a food distribution firm (Vansina, 1970) and I.B.M. World Trade in their educational center (D. Davis). But many more organizations have sent their key people to foreign conferences as training policy. Sensitivity training has, however, received its warmest response from social organizations. Social workers, social nurses, parents and youth leaders were among the first to include training groups in their educational or follow-up programs. Then the churches and various religious orders gained interest in this approach to renew or to deepen their religious conviction or to initiate a program of organizational change (De Cock, 1968). More recently, the laboratory methodology is appearing in the curriculum of university departments in social sciences, or is considered to be part of the training in psychotherapy. In most cases, faculty members and our outside trainers share the trainer's role in these T-groups for students. This is said to facilitate comparison and understanding of attitudes towards the outside trainer and the faculty-member-trainer. The last development of the laboratory methodology in Western Europe is its application in organizational development. In this field, the training-group – or some variation of it

– is introduced as a preparation for solving problems existing within the organization. Its role can then be used in building sufficient openness and trust to allow free discussion of organizational issues; to learn about group work and hidden agendas or to strengthen one's motivation towards improving the organization.

To summarize: Sensitivity training is thus moving in the varied directions of industrial, social and professional organizations. Although various objectives are being pursued, more work could be done on improving international relations, and conflict resolution. Furthermore, it appears, that besides the mini-society labs, most programs are designed for participants belonging to a higher or middle social class.

Differences between Europe and U.S.A.

Although heavily inspired and influenced by N.T.L. and its members, sensitivity training in Europe has some notable features of its own. The basic philosophy behind the European work is different, as well as the culture which the participants bring to the conference. Unfortunately, not much research is being done on this subject, and one relies only on observations, incidents, and comparisons of scientific literature.

European trainers focus more on the understanding of the group processes and the basic anxieties and needs in the immediate relation than is generally the case in the U.S.A. The works of W. Bion, K. Lewin and philosophers such as M. Scheler, M. Heidegger and J.-P. Sartre have deeply influenced the European behavioral scientists, in particular the work of Max Pagès (Pagès, 1968). The life of the group, according to this author

is nothing but a continuous dialogue to clarify the experience of the immediate (affective) relations which the members develop through being together. Participants in such groups learn about basic aspects of their human existence: anxieties, love and separation; and about the relation with others. The emphasis is placed more on basic existential experiences and less on the more obvious, manifest forms of these experiences. One tends to stand still, for example, by the experience of the inability to communicate one's inner self to others, rather than to explore ways of improving one's communication habits.

European trainers focus more on the occurring authority issues and on the relationship of the members with the trainer than is presently the case in the U.S.A. There may be several explanations for this focus. Firstly, the psychoanalytic background of many trainers: Psychoanalytic theory, especially the works of W. Bion draw attention to the transference phenomena in groups, and in particular, emphasize the importance of the relationship between the trainer and the group. This latter relationship is conceived, by Max Pagès, as a mirror of the relations between the members themselves. Secondly, authority issues: Such issues still play a more important role in a group in Europe than in the U.S.A. Many American trainers reported that the observed dependency needs of the participants were particularly strong in their European groups, consequently, if the objective of the T-group is to learn about and to develop group work, a high learning priority should be given to clearing the authority issues.

European trainers refrain more from making instrumental interventions, while American trainers are much more eager to 'help' the

group members. Behavioral therapy, which stimulated many American trainers to intervene more often in an instrumental way, does not seem to fit the dominant European values. The latter stress understanding, reflection

The 'too-good mother' approach of the trainer is strongly rejected in Europe

and authenticity. Consequently, we feel that instant intimacy exercises in expressing affection or resentment are unnatural and interfere with the basic emotions and anxieties of the group. The 'too-good mother' approach of the trainer, who is haunted by the need to be helpful, to be liked by the group and to avoid aggression, is strongly rejected in Europe. Life, we believe, is not a chain of *immediate* satisfactions, and if one strives to understand and to better real life, one should not pretend it to be a nirvana. Besides, instrumental interventions would make it increasingly difficult to clear the dependency or the authority issues. European trainers reserve much time for the study of *community phenomena or organizational behavior* in the temporary system which is the conference. Furthermore, the community or the organization of the conference is not conceived as one big training group but as a pattern of interrelated groups, developed during the course of the program. In general, the European trainer has more and stronger reservations about *non-verbal exercises* and *sensory development*. The key to this reservation is the observation that both approaches are rather egocentric; the individ-

ual developing or expressing himself or herself, for the sake of development or self-expression. The other-directedness and the relationship with others, which is so important in Europe, is often lost or ignored in such programs. The European research or studies made on training-groups and sensitivity work reflect a higher interest in the socio-psychological *processes* than in the *practical outcomes* or produced changes. On the process side, one has to mention the various studies of the Tavistock Institute (Trist & Sofer, 1959; Sofer, 1961; Bion, 1961; Jaques, 1957, etc.), the outstanding analysis of Max Pagès (1968), the work of Meigniez (1963), the doctoral dissertations of Hoogenraad (1966) and myself (1964). Only a few European social scientists have done some serious research on the outcomes of sensitivity training, namely Moscow (1969, 1970) and Smith (1963, 1965). These differences, however, may not obscure the many similarities in this work on both continents. There is always a risk that a description of observable differences obscures the existing similarities in the work on both continents. This is clearly not our intention, but major differences do exist. To ignore them means ignoring the West European culture.

I repeatedly and purposefully used the word 'differences', because it does not imply any evaluation. Indeed, an evaluation assumes a value position. If one would look at sensitivity work on both continents from the standpoint of practical, and immediate usefulness, one rightfully would conclude that the European approach scores generally lower than the American one. If on the other hand, one values existential depth, then the European approach ranks generally higher than the American one. There remains still a lot to be

learned before the two approaches can find a new, more optimal integration, if this appears to be desirable.

Summary: Sensitivity training in Europe has gradually integrated the cultural values and philosophy of the old continent. This results in some observable differences in emphasis and priorities of learning. Europe opts first for existential depth.

Present concerns and plans

One cannot just leave an historical review of the sensitivity movement in Europe without explicitly discussing the concerns and hopes for the future – which I personally share with my colleagues – about the recent developments within this field. Too many people operate as lone individuals, without the backing and control of a professional institution. Consequently, the field of sensitivity training is being troubled more and more by trainers who are (a) unqualified, (b) seek in this field personal satisfaction at the cost of the 'innocent' participant and (c) use sensitivity training as a banner to cover other goals and values.

Unqualified trainers

A number of psychologists, sociologists, and social workers still believe that with or even without one participant-experience in a training group, one may freely experiment with this methodology on other human beings. In such instances, rather poor, not to say painful results, do not come as a surprise. An example will illustrate what can be expected from unqualified trainers. A general manager broke into tears in the T-group and received warm support for this from an 'unexperienced' trainer. Obviously, the latter saw in

this a demonstrative example that the stereotyped tough manager was a human being after all. Fortunately, the same manager participated in another training group and there it became clear that he used 'softness' to repress his deep rooted anxieties about being firm and aggressive. A company study revealed later that his previous lack of firmness and aggressivity was the key issue in the organization, and in the personal life of the manager as well. Although many social scientists complain about this type of irresponsible behavior (Kuehn & Crinella, 1969; Lakin, 1969) only E.I.T. has a firm set of built-in appraisals, in their program for the development of sensitivity trainers.

Improper need satisfaction and trainer's behavior

I strongly believe that most human beings – if not all – try to satisfy some personal needs in their professional work. The question, therefore, is not whether or not one satisfies personal needs, but *what* the needs are and *how* they are being satisfied. I cannot but agree with Drs. Kuehn and Crinella where they observe: 'It seems that such approaches of the leader (trainer) may serve as an outlet for himself – for behaviors that are not accessible to the leader (trainer) outside the laboratory.' But, this observation is not too helpful. One ought to have a set of criteria to evaluate and to decide whether this or that need-satisfaction-behavior is inappropriate to the trainer's role. It is not good enough to say that all behavior is permitted as long as one can learn from it. One can always attach a learning value to the trainer's behavior and then anything goes! Other trainers will waive the banner of (misconceived) 'authenticity', thus allowing themselves to do anything they like.

'I must be true to myself!' is the statement that legitimizes trainers who have fallen in love with, or feel sexually attracted to one of their T-group members, to have sexual intercourse with them¹, or that allows trainers to break freely staff decisions and agreements. Persons like this are against supervision and countertransference analysis which they regard as paternalistic.

Whether the participant can learn from such satisfaction behavior from the trainer is only one among the many criteria; but it is not an easy one to apply. Indeed, the group does not always have the maturity to pursue the learning goal when the one who represents it – in casu the trainer – is over-emotionally involved himself. It still remains to be seen, whether learning about this particular area of behavior can be considered to be most important. A second criterium is human dignity. The extent to which the participants have the possibility of using options, of studying them and of making decisions in the hic et nunc situation (Lakin, 1969). A third criterium I like to use, is individual growth; the degree to which the participants possibilities for personal growth are maintained or increased. There is some real danger that the trainers – carried away by their feelings of omnipotence – venture into psychotherapeutic interventions, bringing deep emotional problems to awareness. The resulting cognitive awareness rarely produces the desired result. On the contrary, it tends to undermine one's belief in, and willingness to go into, psychotherapy where needed.

Sensitivity training as a means of introducing hidden values

I do not want to argue here to what extent this behavior is related to improper need-

satisfaction on behalf of the trainer, discussed above. The fact is, that one often cannot escape the feeling that T-groups are being used to promote feelings of *revolt* against institutions and society, under the name of training for *social change*. The point I would like to make is that the trainer should be open to the socio-political (and ethical) values he or she *intends to introduce* in the course. The program brochure should clearly inform the public about its objectives. The participants have the right to have this information in advance so that they can question actual deviations from these stated objectives, in the course of the program.

Some centers put so much pressure upon their staff that they have to pretend to be qualified

Many trainers operate from institutions that are not designed for, or capable of, taking the responsibility of sensitivity programs. The director's knowledge about sensitivity training may be too limited or his actions may be predominantly guided by financial considerations to hire and keep qualified professional talent, and to provide a secure base from which the professionals can work, learn and handle possibly disturbed participants. Some centers put so much pressure upon their staff that they have to pretend to be qualified, and must cover up unfavorable incidents. In such circumstances, it becomes very hard to learn from one's experience, one's countertransference behavior and to maintain professional standards.

More and more people, however, are becoming aware of these almost inevitable weaknesses and dangerous developments within sensitivity training. Concrete plans are being made to improve or build institutions which have the competence and the organizational capabilities to research, develop and apply the laboratory methodology. First, one has to develop professional and institutional competence, before claiming the right to train, and supervise other professional talent; as well as maintaining high standards. I know of two such projects, one of international and the other of national scope. E.I.T. is vesting considerable effort in designing a genuine international training of trainers program and in providing the institutional means for adequate supervision, and continual learning. Hopefully, they will also be able to make more use of the research and conceptual competence within their membership body, thus providing a theoretical and empirical spine for the sensitivity movement in Europe. In Holland, the universities, the public administration and the professional associations are jointly planning to build an Institute in Applied Group Dynamics (Stichting Toegepaste Groepsdynamica). They will become responsible for training of sensitivity trainers, the coordination of training programs and research projects in applied group dynamics. Such an institution may not provide *maximum* opportunity for free experimentation in this field, but they can guarantee continuation in research and application, leading to goal-oriented innovations. Summarizing, our concerns about the diffusion of laboratory methodology find their roots in the increasing popularity that encourages unqualified individuals to experiment with other human beings. What seems

to be needed most – if one opts for responsibility – is a recognized professional organization that has the institutional capabilities to

develop the necessary talent and the maintaining of professional standards and ethics. ■

¹ At present one has to make such observations explicit. The professional code of ethics, usually only had to imply that sexual behavior in a professional relation was unacceptable. Now, with the turbulent changes in values, one has to write it down explicitly.

Refereren aan:

.....

Vansina, L. (1996). Sensitivity training or laboratory methodology in Western Europe. *Groepen. Tijdschrift voor groepsdynamica & groepspsychotherapie*, 20(3), p. 23-35.

Literatuur

.....

Bion, W.R. (1959). *Experiences in groups*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Bridger, H. (1965). An intergroup project. In: G. Whitaker (Ed.), *T-group training: Group dynamics in management education*. ATM Occasional Papers No. 2. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

De Kock van Leeuwen, J.A.C. & Van Ravenzwaaij, J.F. (1968). De laboratorium-methode van training in tussenmenselijke verhoudingen ten dienste van veranderingen in organisaties. *Mens en Organisatie*, 22.

De Kock van Leeuwen, J.A.C., Schröder, M. & Van der Vegt, R. (1964). Vier jaren ervaring met training in tussenmenselijke verhoudingen in Nederland. *Mens en Onderneming*, 18.

De Cock, G. (1968). Werken met commissies tijdens het kapittel gebeuren. *De Kloosterling, Tijdschrift voor Religieuzen*, 36, p. 224-238.

Higgin, G. & Bridger, H. (1965). *The psychodynamics of an intergroup experience*. Tavistock Pamphlet, No. 10.

Hjeltholt, G. (1963). Training for reality. *N.T.L. Human Relations Training News*, 7(4).

Hofstede, G.H. & Lindner, T. (1968). *Measuring social distance: Computer analysis of sociometric data as a means to identify informal subgroupings in social systems*. Mimeographed paper.

Hogenraad, R. (1966). L'évolution de la contrainte du contexte sur le processus de signification dans deux cas d'analyse de groupe [The progress of contextual constraint on meaning in two cases of group analysis]. *Journal de Psychologie*, 63, p. 437-462.

Jaques, E. (1957). Social systems as a defense against persecutory and depressive anxieties. In: M. Klein, P. Heimann & R. Money-Kyrle (Eds.), *New directions in psychoanalysis* (p. 478-488). New York: Basic Books.

Kraak, J.H. (1960). *Developing social skills: Experiences in the Netherlands with a modified laboratory design*. Zeist: Nederlands Pedagogisch Instituut.

Kuehn, J. & Crinella, F.M. (1969). Sensitivity training: Interpersonal overkill and other problems. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 126(6).

Lakin, M. (1969). Some ethical issues in sensitivity training. *American Psychologist*, 24, p. 923-928.

Lippitt, R. (1949). *Training in community relations: A research exploration toward new group skills*. New York: Karper.

Meigniez, R. (1963). *Cinq études sur le groupe-centré-sur-le-groupe*. Mimeographed paper.

Moscow, D. (1968). *The influence of interpersonal variables on the transfer of learning from T-groups on the job situation*. Paper presented at the XVIth International Congress of Applied Psychology, Amsterdam.

Moscow, D. (1969). T-group training in the Netherlands: An evaluation and cross-cultural comparison. *Mens en Onderneming*, November.

Pagès, M. (1959). Note sur le T-groupe ou groupe de diagnostic. *Bulletin de Psychologie Sociale*.

Pagès, M. (1969). *La vie affective des groupes: Esquisse d'une théorie de la relation humaine*. Paris: Dunod.

Pugh, D. (1965). T-group training from the point of view of organization theory. In: G. Whitaker (Ed.), *T-group training; Group dynamics in management education*. ATM Occasional papers No. 2. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Smith, P.B. (1963). Attitude changes associated with training in human relations. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, p. 105-113.

Smith, P.B. (1965). The effects of T-group Training. In: G. Whitaker (Ed.), *T-group training: Group dynamics in management education*. ATM Occasional Papers No. 2. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Sofer, C. (1961). *The organization from within*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Trist, E.L. & Sofer, C. (1959). *Explorations in group relations*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Vansina, L. (1967). Training groepen en leidersidentiteit: Een studie over waardenwijzigingen en onderliggende psychische processen. *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor de Psychologie*, XXII, p. 7-30.

Vansina, L. (1970). *Sensitivity training within the organization* [prepublication draft].

.....