The New Johari Window
#23: Quadrant Two: Interpersonal Needs

William Bergquist, Ph.D.

Our analysis of Quad Two is concerned with what other people observe in our behavior that leads them to assume (rightly or wrongly) that we have certain needs. If we are proactive (internal locus of control) is our expression of interpersonal needs, than the manifestation of our needs is to be found in Quadrant One. If we are reactive (external locus of control) than our needs must be discovered by other people—and their assessment of our needs may often be wrong, given that we have not articulated these needs ourselves. Other people must fill in the blanks and will often do so with untested assumptions about what we want and need.

The distinction between proactive and reactive expression of interpersonal needs becomes particularly important when we examine the dynamics of Quad Two. Will Schutz made a distinctive and important contribution to the study of interpersonal relationships when he identified not only the overt expression of an interpersonal need, but also the presence of unexpressed needs. When we are proactive, it is not only the case that our needs can be readily identified by other people, it is also the case that our behavior as motivated by these needs is less likely to be a surprise. Conversely, a reactive stance tends to encourage an expanding Q2. Other people must guess not only which interpersonal needs we wish to meet, but also which behaviors are likely to emanate from these needs.

Interpersonal needs are often difficult to fulfill through Q2, because we can't directly determine —though usually can influence—the actions taken by other people. We hope that they will say something to us about our actions that will make us feel welcomed (inclusion), more powerful (control) or more trusted (openness), but this isn't in our hands. Thus, people with a strong internal locus of control tend not to rely on this quadrant (Q2) or on reactive

need fulfillment strategies.

Conversely, those with an external locus look to reactive strategies, and try to place themselves in settings where other people will be cognizant of their interpersonal needs and will attempt to fulfill these needs. Those with an external locus, for instance, might seek out a friendly tavern or (at the opposite end of the spectrum) a welcoming church or temple. With these general observations about proactive and reactive needs expression in mind, let us turn specifically to the three interpersonal needs identified by Will Schutz.

Inclusion

Those with a strong need for inclusion and an external locus (reactive) focus must address a fundamental interpersonal issue: "Do they really want me?" This fundamental question is closely tied to their sense of self-esteem and sense of vulnerability. There are two closely related statements: "I want others to invite me to join the group and want others to be involved in the selection of other group members." "I fear that I will be left out of a group of which I want to be a member or that I will be involved with a group that isn't really very inviting."

As we turn specifically to Quad Two, the primary issue is: "Do other people accurately assess the extent to which I wish to be included in a specific relationship [or group]?" If I have a high need for inclusion, then the answer to this question is particularly important. If other people don't know I want to be included, then they might not invite me in.

A second factor might be even more important: if other people don't want me to be included in a specific relationship or group, then they are unlikely to invite me in, even if they sense that I want to be included. Similarly, if they do not themselves have a strong need for inclusion, then they are likely to ignore our reactive expression of inclusion needs. On the other hand, if they would like me to be included, have a relatively high need for inclusion themselves, and observe (or infer) our wish to be included, then they are likely to invite us in.

What if we have a low need for inclusion – but do not proactively indicate to other people that we really don't particularly want to be included (Quad One)? In these instances, we have a difficult choice to make if we are invited into a relationship or group. We can decline the invitation and risk alienating the other person or other group members – especially since they must infer the reason for our decline. If we say "no" to an invitation, other people might conclude that we don't like them or don't respect what they stand for or want to achieve in this particular relationship or group. They are unlikely to conclude that we don't want to be included simply because we have a low need for inclusion.

If we can be explicit about our low need for inclusion, then other people who want us to enter into a relationship with them or join their group can engage a different strategy. They might, for instance, allow us to "slowly" enter the relationship or group. Those with low needs for inclusion often prefer a gradual entrance to leaping in. The person (persons) offering the invitation to join might also appeal to other needs that are strong. They can suggest that this relationship or group is likely to be important in achieving some purpose or goal (appealing to the need for control or influence).

Instead, they might suggest that this relationship or group is likely to become a setting in which there is a fair amount of candor (appealing to the need for openness). There is a third strategy: the invitation can be withdrawn and the other person (people) can wait for the person they invited to offer their own invitation. Just because someone has a relatively low need for inclusion, does not mean that they never want to join a relationship or group. It only means that they are likely to be cautious and highly selective in the choices that they make. The best strategy might be one of waiting for the other party to do the inviting.

Control

Those with a strong need for control, coupled with an external, reactive focus must address a somewhat different issue than do those with reactive inclusion needs). Those

with a high, reactive need for control must seek out answers to a question that is fundamental to their interpersonal relationships: "Is anyone in charge?" There are two closely related statements: "I want someone else in this relationship or group to provide leadership and assume authority and responsibility." "I fear that no one will provide much direction in this relationships or group, leaving the relationship or group unfocused and chaotic."

When we specifically turn to Quad Two, the question to be asked is altered a bit: "Does anyone know about my need (or lack of need) for exerting control in this relationship (group) or about my need (or lack of need) for someone else to exert control in this relationship (group)?" When my need for control is being engaged primarily through the second quadrant, then other people must detect (or infer) my need for control or influence or my need to have someone else take charge.

Our desire to be in charge (proactive) is manifest in many ways. We can openly express our desire (Q1) for control, but this is not acceptable or "polite" in many societies. Furthermore, we often are not even openly aware of this need. As a result, our desire for control or influence is often expressed indirectly – through our tendency to interrupt other people, excessive advice-giving or criticism, or (from a more positive perspective) enthusiasm regarding a specific project or the willingness to lend a hand in organizing or enacting a specific project.

The same dynamic often operates in one's expression of a need for someone else to be in charge. We usually express this need indirectly. Rarely do we say: "hey . . . isn't anyone going to run this show!" – though we might like to be this candid (Quad One) when we find ourselves working in a messy and disorganized setting. Anarchy is rarely pleasant! We may complain a bit about disorganization or the failure of our group to complete a task, but we usually are not candid enough (Q1) or insight enough to indicate that we are uncomfortable with a lack of clear leadership or guidance. Our expression of a

reactive need for control out there among other parties in the relationship or group is more likely to "leak out" (from Quad 3 or even Quad 4). This need is subsequently observed, but not acknowledged or discussed by other people in the relationship or group (hence it is situated in our second quadrant).

We indirectly express this reactive need by identifying concerns but looking to other people for solutions to these concerns, by sitting back (rather than volunteering to engage in) a specific task or by offering many questions but few answers. This reactive stance may help to encourage other people to exhibit their own leadership strategies and to fulfill their own need for proactive control, and may build ownership on the part of other people for a specific solution or project.

This reactive strategy, however, can also produce frustration on the part of other people as they look to us to share responsibility and leadership. Given that we are not being explicit about our reactive (passive) need for someone else to take charge, we are quite vulnerable to stereotypes (e.g. women always want men to take charge). We are also vulnerable to projections. For example, another person with a strong proactive need for control may assume that we also want to take control and may assume that we are being coy or manipulative in getting the group to turn to us, eventually, for this control). Other untested assumptions about us may also reside in our second quadrant and the other person's third quadrant. If we are not explicit then other people are free to write whatever they want about us on the blank slate that resides in our second quadrant.

What about if we have a low need for control? An important dynamic operates in Quad Two with regard to low need for control. When we remain passive, this may be because we simply don't need much clarity or many accomplishments in this relationship or group. We can either explicitly state our low need for either proactive or reactive control, or we can sit back and let other people recognize our low need for control.

Unfortunately, as in the case of those with a high reactive need for control, other people may infer many things about us if we remain silent. They might infer that we want them to take charge – and not tell us that this is their inference. An awkward (and frustrating) scenario may (and often does) play out: we want things to operate in a relaxed manner, while our colleague desperately tries to organize things, assuming that this is what we want.

They might instead infer that we are indifferent to them or to their project – hence don't really even want to be involved in the relationship or group – and they might be right. Schutz suggests that relationships or groups in which control issues are never addressed or unsuccessfully addressed are often ones in which the initial issues of inclusion were also never successfully addressed. He suggests that we must return to the domain of inclusion and to the formation of the relationship or group. Once we get this right, we can move on to the domain of control and can confront the stage of storming in a successful manner.

Openness

There is a third interpersonal need that may be associated with the external focus and reactive strategy. Those with a strong need for openness and an external, reactive focus will formulate the fundamental issue this way: "How open do I want you to be?" There is a closely related question: "To what extent do I want to feel obligated to you and our relationship?" These questions are often associated with two other sentiments. First, "I want other people in this group to share their feelings, thoughts and reactions with me." Second, "I fear group settings in which members remain quiet and are reticent to talk about what is really happening in the group."

With specific regard to Quad Two, the fundamental questions get reframed: "How aware are you of my need for openness or my need for you to be open with me?" Conversely, if I have a

low need for openness, the fundamental questions are: "How aware are you of my reluctance to be open with you or of my wish that you not be very open or disclosing with me?" What does it mean that other people see us as wanting openness, but that we are unaware of this need?

First, it makes a big difference as to whether or not these other people believe that we want to be open with them (proactive openness) or we want them to be open with us (reactive openness). In the case of proactive openness, other people are likely to assume that we want to be open not so much because we say we do (Quad One), but because we are actively disclosing information about ourselves (moving material from Quad Three to Quad One). When it comes to the dimension of interpersonal openness, other people are more likely to believe our actions than our expressed intentions.

However, if we are disclosing quite a bit, then we are likely to be aware of our openness. It is not hidden from our view (Quad Two). On the other hand, if we are "leaking" from our third quadrant into Quad One and are unaware of this leakage, then other people are likely to see this not as a sign of openness on our part, but rather as a sign of our immaturity, insecurity or perhaps inability to monitor or control our emotions or thoughts.

There are several other scenarios to play out with specific regard to the settings in which other people recognize (or assume) that we want them to be open with us. First this need for reactive openness is likely to be in Q2 if we are highly vulnerable—to the extent that we can't even acknowledge that other people could be of assistance to us. A woman with breast cancer or a man who is alcoholic might resist attending a support group for cancer sufferers or alcoholics. This woman or man might be unwilling (or unable) to acknowledge that they need (and would benefit from) other people being open with them about their own fears and hopes regarding cancer or alcoholism. It is hard to give these vulnerable people feedback about the need for openness in other people that might (or might not) exist in their second quadrant.

There is a second scenario with regard to a setting in which the desire for other people to be open is not acknowledged. This is a setting that is filled with betrayal. We feel that we were betrayed by our spouse or our boss and believe that we can no longer trust anyone. We refuse to acknowledge a fundamental paradox: it is precisely at this moment of maximum betrayal and mistrust (of intentions) that we most need to trust our friends and other family members so that we can not only be open with them about our grief, but they can be open with us about their sorrow regarding our betrayal as well as their own experiences of betrayal (they are not our non-disclosing therapist – they are our mutually-sharing friend or family member).

The third scenario regarding Quad Two placement of reactive need for disclosure on the part of other people concerns settings in which there is maximum ambiguity and minimal structure—such as we find in t-groups, sensitivity groups and Encounter groups (American school). In such a setting, we assume that everyone wants to be open—otherwise, why would they participate in this program. This assumption often is not acknowledged by us (hence is located in Quad Two), but may have a major influence over our own behavior in the group and our own readiness to receive information from other people about themselves (Quad Three to Quad One) and about ourselves (Quad Two to Quad One).

The British school offers an even more profound interpretation. Members of a group (for example, in a Group Relations conference) not only assume (in an often- unacknowledged way) that other members of a group want to be open, they also collude to ensure that this open disclosure takes place. Group members are punished (criticized, ostracized) for not being "genuinely" open regarding their thoughts and feelings regarding the overall group and specific members of the group.

There are three other scenarios that we can play out with regard to Quad Two openness—either our own openness or are desire that other people be open with us. Typically, people who have deep insights about us in their professional capacity—as our therapist, counselor or coach--often believe that we want to be open with them, but that we are unaware of this need.

They "know" (assume) that we want to be open because we have sought out their help; however, the issue of openness (and our resistance to being open) might be one of the fundamental issues we wish to address in our sessions with them. In addition, these human service professionals typically assume either that we don't want them (as our professional helper) to be open with us, or that we understand that it is inappropriate for them to be open with us (even though we might want this to occur).

A second scenario brings us back to the British school dynamic of projection. Other people may assume we want to be open with them or that we want them to be open with us because of their own need for openness. I am frequently reminded of this dynamic when I'm on a long flight across the United States. All-too-often, I'm sitting next to someone who is not only disclosing everything about their life to me, but is also expecting me to tell them everything about my own life. They assume that I am interested in their disclosure and that I am delighted with the prospect of sharing with them.

In most instances, both of these assumptions are inaccurate and I believe that I am offering very few verbal or nonverbal indications that I have a high need (or any need) for openness in this setting. I suspect, in most cases, that I am a "victim" of their projections. They assume that I want what they want – otherwise their insistence upon telling me their life story (even when I put on my headphones) would be recognized by them as a rude and unwanted invasion of my own personal space (which it is). Their projections save them from facing the fact that they have been inappropriate in their interpersonal relationships with me.

The third scenario is similar to the second, in that it is based on the foundation of untested assumptions about other people's needs for openness. In this case, the culprit is not projection; rather, it is stereotyping. We might assume that women always (or usually) want to be open and want us to be open with them. Alternatively, we assume that all Italians want to share their feelings and want us to share our feelings. We might instead (or additional) assume that all men find it difficult to be open or that they don't want other people to be open with them.

Perhaps we assume that all Scandinavians "want to be alone." They find little need to share their feelings with other people and feel uncomfortable when other people share their own feelings with them. While there certainly are differences in ways in which men and women are socialized with regard to openness (and with regard to inclusion and control), this socialization doesn't always "take" and there are many exceptions to the rule in most postmodern societies. Furthermore, there are major cultural differences with regard to openness; these differences, however, usually concerns the ways in which we are open, the people with whom we are open, and the content (thoughts and feelings) about which we are open. Cultural differences typically do not dictate how open we should be as a general principle, or how open we should expect other people to be with us.

Only the first of these three later scenarios offer us the opportunity to receive important information about ourselves if other people share this feedback with us about their perception of our desire for openness (moving material from our second quadrant into our first quadrant). As Joe Luft suggests, not all feedback is beneficial (or accurate or well-intended)—so we must be discerning about who we invite to give us feedback, as well as thoughtful in our interpretation and acceptance of the feedback we do receive.

In elaborating all of the scenarios regarding Quad Two openness, I have hopefully conveyed something about the complexity of Quad Two openness. While Quad Two inclusion and control are highly dynamic and complex, Quad Two openness is particularly dynamic and complex. As a relationship matures (and as a group matures), it not only moves, typically, from primary concern with inclusion and formation issues to primary concern with control and storming issues and, eventually, to primary concern with openness and norming issues, it also moves toward increasingly complexity with regard to the expression and enactment of interpersonal needs—especially when these needs reside in Quad Two and (as we will soon see) Quad Three and Quad Four.

Challenge One: Moving Needs into Q1

How do we make our needs known? How do we place them in the public sector (Q1)? Many strategies are now being employed. I will identify four, beginning with the one that has been mostly commonly used over the past forty years and that served as a foundation for Joe Luft's work. This first strategy is the *unsystematic exploration and discussion* of interpersonal needs. Luft and many other trainers and educators (including myself) have engaged this strategy through conducting T (Training) Groups, Encounter Groups and other related small group exercises. By setting up a training group with minimal structure, no explicit task (other than exploration of personal and interpersonal dynamics), and facilitative (rather than directing) leadership, one can provide rich opportunity for the identification and exploration of interpersonal needs by all participants.

To the extent that presence and magnitude of interpersonal needs are specific to certain interpersonal circumstances, these training groups can be constituted of people who work together on a regular basis. So-called "team-building" exercises[i] can be quite powerful with regard to not only improvement of group functioning, but also the appropriate and appreciated movement of interpersonal needs into Quad One. In recent years, organizational coaching has become another powerful vehicle for the identification of interpersonal needs and for the exploration of ways in which these needs are manifest by and influence the behavior and decisions being made by those men and women who are being coached.[ii]

A second strategy concerns the systematic exploration and discussion of interpersonal needs through the use of *questionnaires and surveys.* The most widely-used of these interpersonal needs surveys was developed by Will Schutz himself. This is the FIRO-B (Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation-Behavior). This awkwardly titled survey provides the respondent with ratings of magnitude for all three of Schutz's needs: inclusion, control and openness.

In addition, it provides sub-scores for both expressed (proactive) and wanted (reactive)

manifestations of these three needs. Expressed needs are those that the respondent actively seeks to fulfill, whereas the wanted needs are those that the respondent hopes that other people will help him fulfill. Schutz developed a second set of instruments, called "Element-B," which offer a more complex set of analyses concerning these three needs. (reference)

While both of Schutz' sets of instruments are carefully designed and have built a strong record of validation, they are not highly reliable, with regard to consistency in test-retest scores. This is not necessarily a negative feature, for the Schutz' instruments are excellent measures of shifting interpersonal needs. Results from these instruments suggest that the context within which an interpersonal relationship is established and takes place, and the nature of the relationship itself, has a great influence over the presence and magnitude of specific needs.

There is another important way in which interpersonal need instruments can be used. While the primarily Schutz instruments are geared toward self-assessment, rich information can be gained by offering comparable instruments to colleagues of the respondent, who are asked to provide feedback regarding what they see as the interpersonal needs being manifest by the respondent. Will Schutz offers a "Feedback" Edition of Element B which provides this type of information, as does a second instrument, the Interpersonal Need Inventory (INI) which is available from the Center for Personal and Organizational Assessment (CPOA) (reference). CPOA offers both a self-assessment and other-assessment/feedback version of the INI. In addition, it provides a third inventory, which assesses the organizational culture in which the interpersonal need is being engaged, displayed and interpreted. The same three Schutz' needs are assessed with the three CPOA instruments.

Several obvious advantages are inherent in the use of questionnaire and survey results. The questionnaire results can be shared and discussed with other people in a relationship, thereby allowing for greater disclosure and feedback regarding the often sensitive issues associated with the expression and fulfillment of interpersonal needs. The questionnaire results also provide a "neutral" set of categories for the discussion of interpersonal needs. Schutz provides

a vocabulary ("inclusion," "control," "openness") for people to talk about their relationships.

Third, the questionnaire and survey results allow for comparisons among people. I can be more "in need of control" than you are, and you can be more "in need of openness." We can both be less in need of inclusion than are most people. These comparisons can be very liberating when they are treated not as "good" and "bad" personality traits, but rather as legitimate and appropriate interpersonal differences. This more constructive comparison often is found only when the sharing of interpersonal need scores is facilitated by an experienced trainer, consultant or coach.

A third strategy is closely related to the second, though it is interactive in nature, rather than being based on administration of a specific questionnaire or survey. This third strategy is the systematic exploration and discussion of interpersonal needs through the use of *group exercises.* Often used as a team-building tool, the so-called "FIRO Microlab" builds on the FIRO-B survey developed by Schutz. Members of a small group are asked to respond to a set of stem questions regarding inclusion (e.g. "When I enter a new group I am likely to do . . . in order to gain acceptance."), control (e.g. "I will give up control in a group to another person if they can show me that they can do . . .") and openness (e.g. "I am likely to open up to another person when they do . . .").

By moving systematically through a set of 10 to 15 questions (equal number in each of the three need categories), and by starting with inclusion and then moving on to control and, finally, to openness, a small group of workshop participants can gain considerable insight about their own interpersonal needs. They can compare their own needs—and how and when these needs are manifest—with other members of their discussion group. The FIRO-Microlab is even more powerful when used as a team-building tool with a newly formed task group. Members of the group move through the questions in one to two hours and at the end of this process are often in a place to move rapidly (and with interpersonal understanding and appreciation) into the convening task. In an era of short-term task forces and ad hoc work

groups, the FIRO-Microlab has become a valuable tool for the facilitation of interpersonal and group relations.

The fourth strategy is the most controversial and often the most powerful. It concerns the exploration and discussion of underlying and often unacknowledged interpersonal needs through the use of *projective techniques and analyses.* Underlying this strategy is the assumptions that we often do not recognize our own interpersonal needs and that we often project these needs out into the group or onto other members of the group (the British School's perspective). The Group Relations Conferences conducted by the Tavistock Institute in England, as well as by the A.K. Rice Institute (Washington D.C.) and GREX organization (San Francisco), focus in particular on these unacknowledged interpersonal needs and ways in which these needs are displayed indirectly and through collusion in a group.

Often the group facilitator is a recipient of these projected needs (as is the case with psychodynamic-oriented psychotherapists). The group's task is to identify and analyze the nature of these projections. At a somewhat more basic level, one can use motion pictures as effective devices for identifying projected interpersonal needs. A colleague of mine, for instance, asks workshop participants to bring their favorite movie about leadership to the workshop and to identify a specific scene in that movie that demonstrates effective leadership. Each participant presents her segment from the movie and indicates why she thinks it exemplifies effective leadership.

The group members then discuss the interpersonal needs that seem to be manifest in this segment of the movie. From this point, more in-depth discussions take place among the workshop participants (usually in two or three person groups) about how the activities and needs manifest in the movie relate to their own work and needs as leaders in their own organizations. Whether participating in a formal Tavistock workshop or exploring one's own projected interpersonal needs through an "action flick" or a highly romantic film, the value of such experiences is great. These exercises are especially valuable when engaged by men and

women who operate in formal leadership roles—given that they are likely to be vulnerable to the interpersonal need projections of other members of the organization, as well as being inclined to project their own interpersonal needs on to other members of the organization or outside the organization.

What are the desired outcomes of these strategies? They are intended to achieve one or more outcomes. First, each of these strategies helps to legitimize interpersonal needs. Through the use of unstructured group experiences, survey results, group exercises and even discussions about projected needs, people who are engaged in relationships (two person or small group) can find a safe place and are provided with a set of clarifying concepts and terms that enable a thoughtful and insightful dialogue to commence. The second desired outcome relates back to our earlier discussions about social construction of reality (Continental School).

By labeling these interpersonal needs, we give them a reality. Many people who grow up in highly restrained and "rationalistic" societies do not have much access to their interpersonal needs, in part because they have never been provided with words or phrases that can be used to label these needs. I personally find that my clients in coaching, training and consulting sessions often feel "liberated" by a growing familiarity with Will Schutz' three needs. They find that the need for inclusion or openness is not just a sense of being "immature" or "needy" for interpersonal relationships, and that the need for control does not mean that one is an "authoritarian dictator" or "domineering boss."

A third outcome concerns the role played by interpersonal needs in the development of a relationship or group. As I noted earlier in this book, the forming, storming, norming and performing stages of group development reflect shifting emphases on Schutz' three interpersonal needs. In fact, the original model (created by Bruce Tuckman) is based in part on Schutz' sequential evolution of these three needs in an interpersonal relationship or group. During the stage of forming in an interpersonal relationship or group, the need for inclusion is

likely to be high in many (if not all) participants, while the need for control is likely to be high (and is often the cause of conflict) during the storming stage of the interpersonal relationship or group.

Third, the need for openness is likely to be higher (and is more likely to be met) when the group is moving through the norming stage. During this stage, the group is establishing the "true" values and purposes of the interpersonal relationship or group. Finally, all three interpersonal needs are likely to be in play during the fourth stage (performing) and to be of greater or lesser importance as a function of the specific challenges being faced within the interpersonal relationship or group.

Challenge Two: Moving from External to Internal Locus of Control

When we look at the Johari Window, several strategies become apparent with regard to helping us become more personally effective in expressing and meeting our interpersonal needs. When we link the stages of interpersonal and group development (from Schutz and Tuchman) (see discussion in Chapter Three) to the dynamics of the four quads of Johari, an interesting dynamic appears. The forming stage, with inclusion being the primary focus, is closely associated with the management of Q1. It is the most externally-focused of the developmental stages.

The second stage, storming, primarily involves reticent feedback (Q2) and reticent disclosure (Q3). Control lies at the heart of the matter with regard to interpersonal issues during this stage. It is a particularly frustrating stage for many people (hence the label "storming"), in part because it often is strongly influenced by external forces (though it is not as external in focus as stage one). The third stage, norming, concerns constructive feedback (Q2) and appropriate disclosure (Q3). Some Q4 is also unveiled during this stage of development. It is more under internal control then are the dynamics of either the forming or storming stages. The fourth stage, performing, involves maximum internalization of control and a sustained balance among the four quadrants.

[i] Dyer, William. *Team Building*. (3rd ed) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1994.

[ii] Bergquist, William, Merritt, Ken and Phillips, Stephen. *Executive Coaching: An Appreciative Approach.* Sacramento, CA: Pacific Soundings Press, (Rev Ed.) 2004.