(12)

Research Report 1343

AD-A142 867

Self-Confrontation as a Means of Changing the Values and Behavior of New Infantry Officers

Robert J. Pleban
Frederick N. Dyer
Allan Fenigstein
Richard E. Hilligoss

ARI FIELD UNIT AT FORT BENNING, GEORGIA
TRAINING RESEARCH LABORATORY

U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

September 1983

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

L. NEALE COSBY
Colonel, IN
Commander

Technical review by

Laurel W. Oliver
Paul van Rijn

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-POT, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Research Report 1343	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A142867
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Self-Confrontation as a Means of Changing the Values and Behavior of New Infantry Officers	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED --
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER --
7. AUTHOR(s) Robert J. Pleban, Frederick N. Dyer, Allan Fenigstein and Richard E. Hilligoss	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) --
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavicral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q162722A791
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel Washington, D.C. 20310	12. REPORT DATE September 1983
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 26
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office) --	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE --

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

--

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

--

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

infantry
values
value structures
leadership
value change
self-confrontation

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

The present study assessed the effectiveness of Rokeach's self-confrontation procedure as a means of changing new Infantry officers' values and behavior. Officers assigning a low rate to one of the three "ideal" leadership values of Sense of Accomplishment, National Security, or Physical Fitness were randomly assigned to either a self-confrontation (feedback) or control (no feedback) group. The results indicated that the self-confrontation procedure employed in this research was not effective at inducing value change and only marginally

(Continued on next page)

Item 20 (Continued)

successful at altering behavior. Group differences on various performance indices were most apparent for those officers who were discrepant on the value Sense of Accomplishment. Suggestions for future research are made.

Research Report 1343

Self-Confrontation as a Means of Changing the Values and Behavior of New Infantry Officers

Robert J. Pleban
Frederick N. Dyer
Allan Fenigstein
Richard E. Hilligoss

Submitted by
Seward Smith, Chief
ARI FIELD UNIT AT FORT BENNING, GEORGIA

Approved as technically adequate
and submitted for publication by
Harold F. O'Neil, Jr., Director
Training Research Laboratory

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army

September 1983

Army Project Number
2Q162722A791

Manpower, Personnel, and Training

ARI Research Reports and Technical Reports are intended for sponsors of R&D tasks and for other research and military agencies. Any findings ready for implementation at the time of publication are presented in the last part of the Brief. Upon completion of a major phase of the task, formal recommendations for official action normally are conveyed to appropriate military agencies by briefing or Disposition Form.

Developing effective leadership skills in new Infantry officers continues to be an important concern for the Army. Of further interest is how to provide the necessary leadership training in a cost effective way. This report describes an attempt to assess the utility of a relatively simple procedure referred to as self-confrontation as a means of improving the leadership performance of new Infantry officers.

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

SELF-CONFRONTATION AS A MEANS OF CHANGING THE VALUES AND BEHAVIOR OF NEW INFANTRY OFFICERS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requirement:

This research was conducted to assess the effectiveness of a procedure referred to as self-confrontation as a means of changing the values and behavior of new Infantry officers. This research was based on the assumption that values are important determinants of behavior and that success as an Infantry officer is in considerable measure a direct result of the values held by that officer. The research data thus could provide some insight into how to improve the leadership performance of (potentially) ineffective junior officers.

Procedure:

Data were obtained using a slightly modified version of the Rokeach Value Survey from 750 junior officers enrolled in Infantry Officer Basic Course (IOBC) classes during the period covering May 1980 to February 1981 at Fort Benning, GA. One hundred seventy-eight officers (with both pre- and post-value ratings) were identified as being discrepant based on the relatively low ratings they assigned to one of three "ideal" leadership values: Sense of Accomplishment, National Security, or Physical Fitness. These "discrepant" officers were randomly assigned to either a self-confrontation (feedback) or control (no feedback) group. Approximately ten days after the initial value survey was administered, students in the discrepant feedback condition received a letter in which they were told that they had rated the value Sense of Accomplishment, National Security, or Physical Fitness lower than their peers. They were also told that the particular value in question was rated rather high by the Infantry Branch lieutenant colonels and colonels who were students at the Army War College that year.

Group differences were assessed over five performance indices: administrative (garrison) leadership, tactical (field) leadership, Expert Infantryman Badge (EIB) scores, and two- and five-mile run times. In addition, at the end of the 14-week IOBC course all students once again filled out the modified Rokeach Value Survey.

Findings:

The results indicated that the self-confrontation procedure employed in this research was not effective at inducing value change and only marginally successful at altering behavior. Group differences were most apparent for those officers who were discrepant on the value Sense of Accomplishment. For this particular value-discrepant group, students receiving feedback obtained significantly higher tactical leadership ratings and had faster

two-mile run times than no-feedback students. The low correlation between the three "ideal" values and the five performance measures may have been largely responsible for the ineffectiveness of the self-confrontation procedure.

Utilization of Findings:

The results of the present study indicate that it would be premature to include self-confrontation procedures in the current leadership training of junior officers. If value and behavior reorganization through self-confrontation is to play an important role in the leadership training of new Infantry officers, more effort will be required to determine what values actually drive these individuals and how these values relate to specific indices of leadership performance. Only then will it be possible to test adequately the utility of self-confrontation as a cost effective training technique.

SELF-CONFRONTATION AS A MEANS OF CHANGING THE VALUES AND BEHAVIOR OF NEW INFANTRY OFFICERS

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

SELF-CONFRONTATION AS A MEANS OF CHANGING THE VALUES AND BEHAVIOR OF NEW INFANTRY OFFICERS

INTRODUCTION

The Army has a long tradition of emphasis on appropriate values for its personnel. The values Duty, Honor, and Country, for example, have been the slogan of the U.S. Military Academy since the last century. Appropriate values for the Army are still a large concern of the Army's senior leadership. This may partly reflect current emphasis in behavioral and management science on the association between individual values and individual behavior (Rokeach, 1973, 1979; England & Lee, 1974).

It has been suggested that some of the difficulties new officers encountered in developing their leadership abilities stem from value structures which are more suited to individual academic achievement than to the role of military leadership (Fenigstein, 1980). If this reasoning is correct, then one means of improving the leadership ability of new Infantry officers may be to alter inappropriate leadership values.

Extensive work by Rokeach (1973) and his colleagues has provided a sound theoretical framework for understanding the nature of values and their relationship to behavior. Rokeach's (1973) theory is based on the assumption that persons possess hierarchically ordered belief systems in which self-concepts, i.e., cognitions about one's competence and morality, are the most central elements. Values, i.e., enduring beliefs that specific modes of conduct or states of existence are preferable to opposite modes or states, are the next most important element in the belief system. Within this system, values provide standards which serve to maintain and enhance self-concepts. An awareness of a contradiction between values and self-conceptions should, according to the theory, lead to a negative state of self-dissatisfaction. One means of reducing this negative affective state is for the individual to reorganize discrepant aspects of the less central value system so as to produce consistency with self-conceptions. Because of the dynamic relationship between values and behavior, value system reorganization should lead to value-related behavior change (Rokeach, 1973).

Thus, to induce value change (and subsequent value-related behavior change), one must be made aware of inconsistencies existing between values and self-conceptions. This is accomplished through a procedure known as self-confrontation. This technique involves presenting individuals with objective feedback and interpretations concerning their own and significant others' values, attitudes, and behavior. Prior research suggests that this feedback makes subjects aware of existing contradictions or inconsistencies within their belief systems (e.g., Rokeach, 1968, 1971, 1973), arouses self-dissatisfaction to the extent that self-conceptions are implicated (e.g., Rokeach, 1968, 1971, 1973), and results in long-term cognitive and behavior changes (e.g., Rokeach, 1973; Cochrane & Kelly, 1971; Hollen, 1972; McClellan, 1973).

The original studies of self-confrontation involved values and behaviors related to racism and civil rights (Rokeach, 1973). In these studies

experimental subjects were confronted with information suggesting that their belief in the importance of the value Equality was relatively low compared to peer ratings and, therefore, inconsistent with the subjects' (assumed) conceptions of themselves as egalitarians. The self-dissatisfaction resulting from the discovery of this inconsistency was hypothesized to increase subjects' regard for the importance of the value Equality which in turn was expected to produce changes in behavior implicated by this value. Results confirmed these expectations. Experimental subjects showed significantly higher ratings for Equality and were more likely to join the NAACP when solicited to do so than comparable control subjects. These findings were later confirmed by Rokeach and Cochrane (1972) and Rokeach and McClellan (1972).

Subsequent research on self-confrontation indicates that under appropriate circumstances a single treatment can be used to initiate long-term changes in a wide range of important beliefs and behaviors (Grube, Greenstein, Rankin, & Kearney, 1977). For example, in addition to the experiments showing modifications of behaviors, values, and attitudes relating to civil rights, other research has shown that the procedure can be used to effectively alter teaching behaviors (Greenstein, 1976), cigarette consumption (Conroy, Katkin, & Barnett, 1975), duration of eye contact (Penner, 1971), and cognitive variables, e.g., locus of control (Hamid & Flay, 1974).

The purpose of the present research was to assess the effectiveness of self-confrontation as a means of changing leadership-related values and behavior of new Infantry officers in the U.S. Army. More specifically, it was expected that junior officers who received feedback of their ratings of leadership-related values along with the ratings of the same values by their peers and highly successful senior Infantry officers would show a resulting increase in regard for these values and more effective leadership behavior when compared to those officers who did not receive feedback.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 750 male junior officers enrolled in Infantry Officer Basic Course (IOBC) classes during the period covering May 1980 to February 1981 at Fort Benning, GA, who participated in a Value Survey Study being conducted by the U.S. Army Research Institute. IOBC students' values were assessed at the beginning and upon completion of the course. Pre- and post-treatment value ratings were collected on 535 students. The remaining 215 students were eliminated from subsequent analyses since they either did not have pre- or post-value ratings. The average age and length of active duty of the 535 IOBC students used in the study was 23 years and 13.6 months, respectively.

Materials

The instrument used was a modified version of the Rokeach Value Survey consisting of 19 terminal (i.e., preferred end-state of existence) and 19

instrumental (i.e., preferred mode of behavior) values. Two additional values, Physical Fitness (terminal) and Active (instrumental), were included in the modified version because of their perceived relevance for Infantry leaders. (See Appendix A, p. A-1, for list of terminal values and p. A-2 for list of instrumental values.)

Procedure

IOBC students were asked to fill out a value survey as part of an ongoing research project being conducted by the Army Research Institute. The instructions provided in the survey asked the students to rate the importance of each of 35 values as guiding principles in their lives. Ratings could range from 1 (Not at all important in my life) to 7 (One of the most important values in my life).

Preliminary research (Dyer & Hilligoss, 1981) on the value ratings of highly successful officers attending the Army War College using the modified Rokeach Value Survey had identified three "ideal" Infantry leader values that may discriminate between new junior officers in IOBC and lieutenant colonels and colonels selected for command: Sense of Accomplishment, National Security, and Physical Fitness. IOBC students who showed large discrepancies (i.e., whose ratings ranged from 1 to 4) on one of the three ideal values were assigned to the value discrepancy group. Of the 535 students who had both pre- and post-value ratings, 178 were identified as being discrepant. Of these 178, 40 were discrepant on the value Sense of Accomplishment; 69 were discrepant on the value National Security; and 69 were discrepant on the value Physical Fitness. The remaining 357 students did not show large enough discrepancies in their ratings (i.e., their ratings ranged from 6 to 7) of the three target values and were assigned to the nondiscrepancy group. Ratings of 5 were judged discrepant when 11 or more of the 19 terminal values were rated greater than 5.

Students in the discrepancy group were randomly assigned to one of two groups: feedback or no feedback.[1] The group breakdown for each of the target values was as follows: Sense of Accomplishment--feedback = 19; no feedback = 21; National Security--feedback = 36; no feedback = 33; Physical Fitness--feedback = 31; no feedback = 38.

Approximately 10 days after the initial value survey was administered, students in the discrepant feedback condition received a letter (see Appendix B) in which they were told that they had rated the value Sense of Accomplishment, National Security, or Physical Fitness lower than their peers. They were also told that the particular value in question was rated rather high by the Infantry Branch lieutenant colonels and colonels who were students at the Army War College that year. The discrepant no-feedback and nondiscrepant students received no feedback concerning their value ratings.

---

[1] Students were randomly assigned to the treatment condition before the post-treatment value survey was administered. Thus, it was possible to have an even number of cases who had both pre- and post-treatment ratings for a particular value yet an unequal number of cases in each treatment condition due to slightly unequal rates of subject loss on the post-treatment value ratings.

At the end of the 14-week IOBC course, all students once again completed the modified Rokeach Value Survey. In addition, five measures of successful leadership performance were obtained. These were administrative (garrison) leadership ratings, tactical (field) leadership ratings, Expert Infantryman Badge (EIB) scores, and times in the two- and five-mile runs.[2]

RESULTS

Assessment of Value Change

Value change was assessed using partial correlation techniques since they allow for a more sensitive analysis of the effects of the treatment manipulation (Cohen & Cohen, 1975; Hummel-Rossi & Weinberg, 1975; Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973). For each value the correlation between post-treatment value ratings and group membership (dummy coded 1 for feedback and 0 for no feedback) was adjusted for differences in pre-treatment value ratings. By utilizing this procedure it is possible to examine, without calculating change scores, the correlation between (regressed) change and group membership (adjusted for differences in pre-value ratings).[3]

After the partial correlations were computed, the resulting values were then squared. The results of these analyses indicated that for Sense of Accomplishment, $\underline{r}^2(37) = .0001$, n.s.; National Security, $\underline{r}^2(66) = .02$, n.s.; and Physical Fitness, $\underline{r}^2(66) = .003$, n.s.; the proportion of regressed changed variance accounted for by group membership (adjusting for differences in pre-value ratings) was negligible.

Table 1 shows the mean pre- and post-treatment ratings for the feedback and no-feedback groups for each of the three values. In all instances post-treatment value ratings exceeded pre-treatment value ratings by approximately one unit. This uniformity of results can probably be attributed to regression artifacts.

In summary, the pattern of results obtained indicates that the feedback manipulation employed in this study was not effective in altering junior officers' belief in the importance of the values Sense of Accomplishment, National Security, or Physical Fitness.

---

[2] Two- and five-mile run times are probably in and of themselves not direct measures of leadership effectiveness, but fitness is believed (by the Army) to be associated with successful leadership performance in both combat and noncombat situations.

[3] In this particular instance, using either partial or semipartial correlation procedures would yield the same result since subjects were randomly assigned to conditions. See Cohen and Cohen (1975, pp. 382-387) for a thorough discussion on using partial correlation techniques to assess change.

Table 1

Mean Pre- and Post-Treatment Value Ratings for the Values Sense of Accomplishment, National Security, and Physical Fitness

Sense of Accomplishment

Treatment	Mean Pre-Treat. Rating	SD	Mean Post-Treat. Rating	SD
Feedback[a]	4.00	.94	4.89	1.73
No-Feedback[b]	4.09	.77	5.00	1.14

National Security

Treatment	Mean Pre-Treat. Rating	SD	Mean Post-Treat. Rating	SD
Feedback[c]	3.83	1.06	5.14	1.53
No-Feedback[d]	3.85	1.00	4.76	1.32

Physical Fitness

Treatment	Mean Pre-Treat. Rating	SD	Mean Post-Treat. Rating	SD
Feedback[e]	4.19	.70	5.19	1.33
No-Feedback[f]	4.32	.74	5.32	1.04

[a] $n=19$. [c] $n=36$. [e] $n=31$.

[b] $n=21$. [d] $n=33$. [f] $n=38$.

Feedback and Performance

The effectiveness of the feedback manipulation on actual performance (administrative leadership, tactical leadership, EIB, two- and five-mile runs) was also assessed. Five analyses of variance were performed for each of the three discrepant value groups.

Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations, effect size (ω^2), and F-values for those officers who were discrepant on the value Sense of Accomplishment. The analyses revealed that feedback students were perceived as more effective tactical leaders $F(1,30) = 8.99$, $p < .01$ and had faster two-mile run times $F(1,32) = 6.55$, $p < .01$ than no-feedback students. In terms of variance accounted for, feedback accounted for approximately 19% of the variance in tactical leadership ratings and 14% of the variance in two-mile run times. Differences on the remaining three performance measures favored the feedback group (i.e., higher administrative leadership ratings, faster five-mile run times, and higher EIB scores) but were not statistically significant.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Size for Each Performance Measure for Officers Discrepant on the Value "Sense of Accomplishment"

Variable	Feedback	SD	No Feedback	SD	Effect Size[a]	F	p
Administrative Leadership	3.96[b]	.62	3.65	.55	.04410	2.75	.10
Tactical Leadership	4.22[b]	.57	3.68	.44	.19997	8.99	.005
EIB	89.42[b]	7.13	85.60	10.96	.01632	1.64	.21
Two-Mile Run	14 min 28 sec	1 min 7 sec	15 min 38 sec	1 min 27 sec	.14039	6.55	.01
Five-Mile Run	36 min 1 sec	3 min 55 sec	38 min 59 sec	4 min 47 sec	.06867	2.69	.11

NOTE. Ns ranged from 11 - 20.

[a]Indexed by Omega Squared (ω^2).

[b]Larger numbers indicate greater leadership effectiveness or skill proficiency.

Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, effect size (ω^2), and F-values for each of the five measures for those officers who were discrepant on the value National Security. The analyses indicated that the feedback and no-feedback groups did not significantly differ from each other on any of the performance measures. The ω^2s associated with each measure were essentially zero.

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Size for Each Performance Measure for Officers Discrepant on the Value "National Security"

Variable	Feedback	SD	No Feedback	SD	Effect Size[a]	F	p
Administrative Leadership	4.05[b]	.63	3.91	.52	.00000	<1	.41
Tactical Leadership	4.02[b]	.58	3.94	.54	.00000	<1	.60
EIB	89.91[b]	11.69	90.64	7.50	.00000	<1	.77
Two-Mile Run	14 min 9 sec	1 min 1 sec	14 min 18 sec	1 min 19 sec	.00000	<1	.66
Five-Mile Run	35 min 7 sec	4 min 19 sec	36 min 40 sec	3 min 38 sec	.01434	1.61	.21

NOTE. Ns ranged from 20 - 33.

[a]Indexed by Omega Squared (ω^2).

[b]Larger numbers indicate greater leadership effectiveness or skill proficiency.

Table 4 shows the means, standard deviations, effect size (ω^2), and F-values for each of the five performance measures for those officers who were discrepant on the value Physical Fitness. As was the case with officers who were discrepant on the value National Security, no significant differences between the feedback and no-feedback conditions were detected. The ω^2s associated with each measure were essentially zero.

In summary, the effects of feedback were most apparent for those officers who were discrepant on the value Sense of Accomplishment. Officers who received feedback and who were discrepant on either the value National Security or Physical Fitness showed no appreciable improvement in performance when compared to officers not receiving feedback.

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Size for Each Performance Measure for Officers Discrepant on the Value "Physical Fitness"

Variable	Feedback	SD	No Feedback	SD	Effect Size[a]	F	p
Administrative Leadership	3.80[b]	.66	3.98	.60	.00367	1.21	.27
Tactical Leadership	3.70[b]	.66	3.87	.59	.00000	<1	.36
EIB	89.20[b]	6.74	88.94	10.44	.03966	3.64	.06
Two-Mile Run	15 min 1 sec	1 min 33 sec	15 min 7 sec	1 min 29 sec	.00000	<1	.82
Five-Mile Run	37 min 51 sec	4 min 59 sec	38 min 39 sec	4 min 42 sec	.00000	<1	.59

NOTE. Ns ranged from 21 - 34.

[a]Indexed by Omega Squared (ω^2).

[b]Larger numbers indicate greater leadership effectiveness or skill proficiency.

The inability of the feedback manipulation either to alter value ratings or to improve performance (with the possible exception of those officers who were discrepant on the value Sense of Accomplishment) suggests that either the feedback did not produce the desired self-dissatisfaction, or the three target values are unrelated to the criterion measures, or both. Since checks were not performed on the affective consequences of feedback, it is not possible to tell unequivocally if feedback was having the desired effects.

Intercorrelations (based on scores from nondiscrepant and discrepant no-feedback officers) between the pre-treatment ratings and the five performance measures were generally low, with no correlation greater than .24 in absolute value (see Table 5). Although some of the correlations were significant, at best only about 5.7% of the variance in any dependent measure was accounted for by initial standing on a given value. Thus, for at least this sample of officers, values were not strongly related to the performance measures in question.

DISCUSSION

The results of the preceding analyses indicated that feedback (self-confrontation) did not significantly increase IOBC students' ratings of

importance of the values Sense of Accomplishment, National Security, or Physical Fitness. The literature previously cited, e.g., Rokeach (1973), Grube et al. (1977), has clearly documented the robustness of this technique, so it was surprising to note the apparent absence of this effect in the present study.

Table 5

Intercorrelations Among Pre-Treatment Value Ratings and Selected IOBC Performance Measures[a]

	Accomp	Natsec	Physfit	Adlead	Taclead	EIB	2 Mile	5 Mile
Accomp		.255*** N=445	.330*** N=446	.069 N=355	.054 N=307	.109* N=415	-.217*** N=327	-.145** N=268
Natsec			.357*** N=445	-.003 N=355	-.017 N=308	.001 N=415	.055 N=327	.073 N=268
Physfit				.020 N=355	.017 N=307	.055 N=415	-.244*** N=327	-.222*** N=268
Adlead					.370*** N=270	-.008 N=353	-.174** N=300	-.139* N=214
Taclead						.091 N=304	-.250*** N=237	-.061 N=209
EIB							-.139** N=326	-.260*** N=267
2 Mile								.775*** N=201

[a]These correlations were based on scores obtained from the nondiscrepant and (discrepant) no-feedback officers.

*p < .05.
**p < .01.
***p < .0001.

As was mentioned earlier, the feedback manipulation may have been ineffective because it failed to generate the necessary feelings of self-dissatisfaction within the students. Assuming that this aversive state was not induced, then there would have been no need on the feedback students' part to alter significantly their ratings of the specific value in question. Examination of the pre- and post-treatment ratings appears to bear this out. Regardless of the value, the ratings of both feedback and no-feedback students increased approximately one unit over sessions.

There may be several reasons for the inability of the feedback manipulation to generate feelings of dissatisfaction. Unlike other studies (see Grube et al., 1977; Rokeach, 1975), feedback students were neither shown the scores of their peers or Army War College students, nor given any explanation of what the discrepancy in value ratings meant. Thus, feedback students knew they had rated one of the values (e.g., National Security) lower in importance than their peers (and Army War College students), but how much lower? Did this mean they would be less likely to succeed, etc.? As a consequence, it's possible that the implications of the feedback were unclear to the students, and, because of this ambiguity, little if any self-dissatisfaction was aroused.[4]

The feedback manipulation may have been further affected by the long time interval (approximately 3 months) between when students received the feedback and when post-treatment value ratings were obtained. If any dissatisfaction was produced, it is quite likely that it either dissipated or was overwhelmed by the busy schedule of events encountered by students during the course long before its effects could be reflected in post-treatment value ratings.

Even if the feedback manipulation had been successful in altering values, it is doubtful whether this would have led to substantive behavior change since the intercorrelations between values (pre-treatment ratings) and behavior were generally low (see Table 5).

One reason for the low intercorrelations may be that the values Sense of Accomplishment and National Security were too broad or abstract in nature and could best account for only a small proportion of variance in the specific criterion behaviors. However, the fact that the relatively specific value Physical Fitness accounted for only about 5.7% and 4.8% of the variance in the two- and five-mile run times, respectively, tends to weaken this argument.

Of all the values, feedback appeared to be most effective in improving the performance of those students who were discrepant on the (general) value Sense of Accomplishment. Why this pattern of results emerged is not exactly clear. Perhaps the implications of being discrepant on this value were less ambiguous and suggested that the student lacked the necessary drive or motivation to be a successful officer. The superior performance of the feedback subjects (on some of the measures) may have been their way of disproving this notion.

While this is certainly plausible, and is consistent with broader versions of Rokeach's theory (Grube et al., 1977), it still represents conjecture.

---

[4] An explicit interpretation was not provided since it was not clear what being discrepant on a specified value actually meant in terms of leadership ability. Given this ambiguity, if interpretations were provided to the students, it could be argued that for some students the interpretations would not be completely accurate and would represent a form of deception. Considering the type of students involved, the potential psychological consequences to the student, and the general attitude of the Army regarding deception, it was decided not to give the students any explanation of what it meant to be discrepant on a particular target value. However, it is possible that this may have severely weakened the feedback manipulation.

In light of the general ineffectiveness of the feedback manipulation to significantly increase value or improve performance in the other two value discrepant groups, the positive findings obtained with the Sense of Accomplishment discrepant group should be interpreted cautiously.

In summary, the results of the present study suggest that if value and behavior reorganization through self-confrontation is to play a role in the leadership training of new Infantry officers, more effort is going to be required to determine what values actually drive these individuals and how these values relate to various specific indices of leadership performance. In the present study, for example, it is not clear how the value National Security should relate to the various performance indices. Should it relate strongly to tactical leadership but not to various fitness measures; should it relate only to performance in certain courses, etc.? Moreover, it is simply unclear what exactly National Security entails. These questions need to be resolved if self-confrontation is to be used effectively as a means of improving the leadership performance of new Infantry officers.

REFERENCES

Cochrane, R., & Kelly, K. (1971). Personality and the differential effectiveness of an experimental value change procedure. Unpublished manuscript.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1975). Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Conroy, W. J., Katkin, E. S., & Barnette, W. L. (1973, April). Modification of smoking behavior by Rokeach's self-confrontation technique. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans.

Dyer, F. N., & Hilligoss, R. E. (1981, May). A comparison of the values of highly successful senior field grade Infantry Officers, company-grade Infantry Officers, and civilians. Draft ARI Research Report, Fort Benning, GA.

England, G. W., & Lee, R. (1974). The relationship between managerial values and managerial success in the United States, Japan, India, and Australia. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 411-419.

Fenigstein, A. (1980). Self-consciousness, self-confrontation, and value change. Unpublished research proposal.

Greenstein, T. N. (1976). Behavior change through value self-confrontation: A field experiment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 254-262.

Grube, J., Greenstein, T., Rankin, W., & Kearney, K. (1977). Behavior change following self-confrontation: A test of the value-mediation hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 254-262.

Hamid, P., & Flay, B. (1974). Changes in locus of control as a function of value change. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 13, 143-150.

Hollen, C. (1972). Value change, perceived instrumentality and attitude change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Hummel-Rossi, B., & Weinberg, S. (1975). Practical guidelines in applying current theories to the measurement of change. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 5, 226. (Ms. No. 916).

Kerlinger, F., & Pedhazur, E. (1973). Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

McClellan, D. (1973). Level of moral development and feedback of information as determinants of value change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Penner, L. (1971). Interpersonal attraction toward a black person as a function of value importance. Personality, (2), 175-187.

Rokeach, M. (1968). A theory of organization and change in value-attitude systems. Journal of Social Issues, 24, 13-33.

Rokeach, M. (1971). Long-range experimental modifications of values, attitudes, and behavior. American Psychologist, 26, 453-459.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human values. New York: Free Press.

Rokeach, M. (1975). Long-term value change initiated by computer feedback. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32(3), 467-476.

Rokeach, M. (1979). Understanding human values. New York: Free Press.

Rokeach, M., & Cochrane, R. (1972). Self-confrontation and confrontation with another as determinants of long-term value change. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, (2), 283-292.

Rokeach, M., & McClellan, D. (1972). Feedback of information about the values and attitudes of self and others as determinants of long-term cognitive and behavioral change. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, (2), 236-251.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS

Below are 19 values listed in alphabetical order. Your task is to rate them on their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life. Circle the number from 1 to 7 to the right of each value which best describes the importance of the value to you.

1. Not at all important in my life.
2. Slightly important in my life.
3. Somewhat important in my life.
4. Moderately important in my life.
5. Highly important in my life.
6. Extremely important in my life.
7. One of the most important values in my life.

Work slowly and consider each value carefully. If you change your mind, feel free to change your answers. The end result should truly show how you feel.

A COMFORTABLE LIFE (a prosperous life)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(17)
AN EXCITING LIFE (a stimulating, active life)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(18)
A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT (lasting contribution)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(19)
A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(20)
A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(21)
EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(22)
FAMILY SECURITY (taking care of loved ones)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(23)
FREEDOM (independence, free choice)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(24)
HAPPINESS (contentedness)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(25)
INNER HARMONY (freedom from inner conflict)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(26)
MATURE LOVE (sexual and spiritual intimacy)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(27)
NATIONAL SECURITY (protection from attack)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(28)
PHYSICAL FITNESS (endurance, strength)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(29)
PLEASURE (an enjoyable, leisurely life)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(30)
SALVATION (saved, eternal life)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(31)
SELF-RESPECT (self-esteem)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(32)
SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, admiration)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(33)
TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close companionship)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(34)
WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(35)

When you have finished, go on to the next page.

INSTRUCTIONS

Below are 19 values listed in alphabetical order. Your task is to rate them on their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life. Circle the number from 1 to 7 to the right of each value which best describes the importance of the value for you.

1. Not at all important in my life.
2. Slightly important in my life.
3. Somewhat important in my life.
4. Moderately important in my life.
5. Highly important in my life.
6. Extremely important in my life.
7. One of the most important values in my life.

Work slowly and consider each value carefully. If you change your mind, feel free to change your answers. The end result should truly show how you feel.

ACTIVE (energetic)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(36)
AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(37)
BROADMINDED (open-minded)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(38)
CAPABLE (competent, effective)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(39)
CHEERFUL (lighthearted, joyful)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(40)
CLEAN (neat, tidy)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(41)
COURAGEOUS (standing up for your beliefs)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(42)
FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(43)
HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(44)
HONEST (sincere, truthful)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(45)
IMAGINATIVE (daring, creative)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(46)
INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(47)
INTELLECTUAL (intelligent, reflective)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(48)
LOGICAL (consistent, rational)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(49)
LOVING (affectionate, tender)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(50)
OBEDIENT (dutiful, respectful)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(51)
POLITE (courteous, well-mannered)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(52)
RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(53)
SELF-CONTROLLED (restrained, self-disciplined)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(54)

When you have finished, go on to the next page.

APPENDIX B
LETTER

PERI-IJ 2 October 1980

SUBJECT: Results of your Recent Value Survey

21st Company
2nd Student Battalion
Fort Benning, GA 31905

1. You are one of 30 students who has been randomly selected to receive feedback on how your Value Survey results differed from your IOBC classmates and from senior Infantry Officers who are students at the Army War College.

2. Compared to most other members of your IOBC class, you rated the value
relatively low. This value was consistently rated very high by the Infantry Branch LTCs and COLs who were students at the Army War College this year.

3. We are providing feedback on a controlled basis so that you may have a chance to compare some of your values with those of your peers and of Army War College students. We are also interested in determining if this feedback influences your performance in IOBC and your future leadership performance. Please feel free to contact me at 545-1414 if you would like further information.

FREDERICK N. DYER, Ph.D.
Research Psychologist