

A STUDY OF SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION

by 1124

GARY MARVIN HOWLAND

B.A., Fort Hays Kansas State College, 1966

---

A NON-THESIS PROJECT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY PLANNING

Department of Regional and Community Planning

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1970

APPROVED BY:

Vernon P. Deines  
MAJOR PROFESSOR

arch  
LD  
2668  
.T4  
1970  
H69

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

I wish to thank Don Root and Pam Ringheim, for their vital and loving assistance in conducting this study. My sincerest appreciation to Dr. Shel Edelman for his friendship and guidance. My thanks to the faculty of the Department of Regional and Community Planning without whose indulgence, patience and help this study could not have been begun nor completed.

G.M.H.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
Introduction .....	1
Goals .....	2
Objectives .....	2
General Hypothesis .....	2
Specific Hypothesis .....	3
Methodology .....	3
Evaluation Questionnaire .....	4
Analysis of the video Taped Sessions .....	11
Group Participation .....	11
Discussions on a Personal Level .....	12
A Coherent Theme .....	14
Recognition of Values and Perspectives... ..	17
Attempts to Summarize .....	19
Conclusions .....	21
Recommendations .....	23
Appendix I .....	26
Appendix II .....	28

## INTRODUCTION

This study generally deals with communication process and group interaction in small groups. It is an attempt to learn something about the factors that influence the quality of a small group. The small group studied in this project was a seminar class consisting of eight graduate students, all in at least their second year of graduate work. With the exception of two, all the students were studying for degrees in community and regional planning. The general topic for the seminar was societal issues and problems relating to planning.

The prime purpose of this study was to improve the overall quality of the discussion and participation, by creating a situation in which the students would become more aware of communication processes and group interaction. This hopefully would demonstrate that the teaching of communication and group dynamics would be a positive addition to the planning curriculum.

This paper documents the steps involved in this study and the results.

### GOALS of this study.

The goals of this study were: (1) to create a situation in which affective communication would be increased, but not to the exclusion of cognitive communication; and (2) to create an awareness among the students of the existence of and usefulness of understanding affective communication.

### OBJECTIVES of this study.

The objectives of this study were: (1) to increase the students knowledge of the communication process and the group dynamics involved in a small group situation such as the seminar; and (2) to add to their effectiveness, as a group, through promoting their interest in and ability to listen. (By listening, I mean not only listening to the words which are spoken, but also, to listen for the deeper meanings and feelings which are communicated at the same time.) Thus, I hope and to add something positive to the conduct of the seminar group and make the sessions more meaningful and worthwhile to the participants in the seminar.

### GENERAL HYPOTHESIS of this study.

By using certain teaching techniques, the awareness of affective communication can be increased and thus communication within the seminar group will reflect a qualitative improvement.

SPECIFIC HYPOTHESIS of this study.

By using the micro-lab, or a similar teaching technique, to teach the communication process, measurable gains can be produced in the students knowledge of the communication process and the effectiveness of the group. Both of these will be reflected by an increase in their ability to listen, in the fullest sense of the word, and increased participation.

METHODOLOGY of this study.

The methodology of this study rests primarily on observation. Since few reliable quantitative measures exist to measure the type of group interaction and communication process dealt with in this study, it was determined that the observation technique was the best available. The observations were conducted by a panel of three persons, the author and two members of the Counseling Center staff. Judgments, by this panel, of the changes resulting from the micro-lab were based upon a comparative analysis of a session of the seminar video taped prior to the micro-lab and a session taped after the micro-lab. An evaluation questionnaire was given to the participants after each session of the seminar. The purpose of this questionnaire was to obtain the participants views of the changes between the two sessions.

The specific steps followed in this study were:

- Step 1. Present the idea of affective communication to the group and note their reactions.
- Step 2. Determine, with the group, the teaching technique to be used in teaching greater awareness of affective communication. In this case, the technique chosen was a single micro-lab.
- Step 3. Video tape a "regular" session before the micro-lab and administer the questionnaire. This session provided the basis for comparison of subsequent sessions.
- Step 4. Conduct the micro-lab.
- Step 5. Video tape a later session for analysis by comparison with the earlier taped "regular" session. Administer the questionnaire for comparison with the earlier questionnaire. This session occurred two sessions after the micro-lab.
- Step 6. Analysis of the video tapes by the panel of observers. Analysis and summarization of the results of the written evaluation questionnaires given to the participants of the seminar each session.
- Step 7. Document and present the findings and results of this project.
- Step 8. Based upon the results of this project make general recommendations regarding the teaching of this aspect of communication in the future.

THE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE used in this study.

This questionnaire was given to each member of the seminar group at the conclusion of the sessions and was filled out by them before they left the room. Therefore, it probably represents only first or immediate impressions without any in-depth thought on the part of the respondents. However, it

was felt that this was superior to allowing the respondents to fill out the questionnaire at any other time. At the conclusion of the session feelings and impressions would be based upon the session itself; a later time would allow other events and emotions to intervene and possibly bias the answers.

The results of the questionnaire indicate that in general the students felt that the third session was superior to the first session. All items, except three, showed a marked increase in positive responses in comparison with the responses to the same questions after the first session.

The responses to questions 4, 8 and 9 (referred to above) showed a tendency to decrease (less positive response) or to stay about the same. This may be explained by the fact that the respondents were more accurately assessing the communication and understanding that took place in the third session than they were in the first session. They may have had a sharper and more aware sense of others feelings and their own as well.

4. Did you gain any insights into the perspectives and opinions of others in the seminar?

	a great deal	somewhat	very little	none at all
1st session	2	5	0	0
3rd session	2	4	1	0

8. Did you gain an understanding of the other participants viewpoints and opinions?

	very much	quite a bit	somewhat	none at all
1st session	1	6	0	0
3rd session	3	3	1	0

9. Did you gain greater understanding of your own viewpoints, opinions and bias'?

	very much	quite a bit	somewhat	none at all
1st session	2	3	1	1
3rd session	2	3	2	0

Item 13 indicates the group felt more as if the third session were a group action rather than individual actions.

13. Was the discussion dominated by a few individuals?

	yes	no
1st session	7	0

What effect did this have on the session?

	good	no effect	bad
1st session	3	3	1

(Note: This question was rephrased for the third session.)

13. How many people participated to the extent you feel they should have in todays session?

	all	a majority	a minority	none
3rd session	1	5	1	0

What effect did this have?

	good	no effect	bad
3rd session	6	1	0

Question 13 would seem to indicate that the sense of group-ness was stronger and the individuals were more aware of it. Items 6 and 7 refer to the openness of the discussion. The results show rather clearly that the students felt the third session was freer and more open.

6. Did this session of the seminar provide a situation in which you could express your own ideas, opinions and viewpoints?

	very much so	somewhat so	not at all	it hindered
1st session	4	1	2	0
3rd session	5	2	0	0

7. Did you express your ideas and opinions as much as you wanted to?

	yes	no
1st session	3	4
3rd session	6	1

The students also felt that the information exchanged was greater and of more value, as indicated in items 1, 2 and 5.

1. Was the seminar today interesting to you?

	very interesting	slightly interesting	not very interesting	not interesting at all
1st session	3	4	0	0
3rd session	5	1	1	0

2. Do you feel you gained any useful knowledge from the seminar today?

	a great deal	somewhat	very little	none at all
1st session	1	4	2	0
3rd session	2	5	0	0

5. Rate the exchange of ideas and information in today's session.

	very good	good	mediocre	poor	very poor
1st session	0	5	2	0	0
3rd session	1	6	0	0	0

Question 3 indicates that when good communication and participation are present the students prefer the unstructured type of session. However, when those elements were not present, in the first session, they showed more inclination to prefer a structured type of session.

3. Do you feel the way this seminar was conducted (i.e. the format or structure) aided communication?

	aided very much	aided somewhat	had no effect	detracted slightly	seriously hindered
1st session	2	2	1	1	1
3rd session	1	4	2	0	0

Questions 10, 11 and 12 deal with the effectiveness of the communication within the group. The responses generally indicate that the students felt the third session was more positive. However, responses may have been altered between the first and third sessions by the micro-lab and the concentration on the communication process. This being true, the responses after the third session should have been more valid than those after the first session. This would be due to the students increased ability to more accurately assess the effective communication during a session.

10. Do you feel your comments were understood by the others?

	very well understood	somewhat understood	not understood at all	totally misunderstood
1st session	1	4	2	0
3rd session	0	7	0	0

11. Do you feel you had an effect upon any of the other participants viewpoints?

	quite a bit	some	very little	none at all
1st session	1	4	1	1
3rd session	0	6	1	0

12. For this session, do you feel the communication between the participants was:

	very good	good	had no effect	poor	very bad
1st session	0	6	1	0	0
3rd session	0	7	0	0	0

Overall, the third session was ranked as better, from both the individual and group standpoints, than was the first. This is indicated by the increased rankings on items 14 and 15.

14. On the following ten point scale rank the general overall quality of this session of the seminar. (10 is high)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	mean
1st session	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	2	0	1	6.57
3rd session	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	8.00

15. On the following scale rate the quality of your own performance in this session. (10 is high)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	mean
1st session	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	5.43
3rd session	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	2	0	7.43

Thus, generally, it can be concluded that the participants felt the third session was better and more worthwhile than was the first.

---

Notes: There were seven (7) respondents in each session. The numerical values shown after each question indicate the number of responses for each alternative answer.

## ANALYSIS OF THE VIDEO TAPED SESSIONS

As pointed out earlier in the methodology discussion, an analysis of two sessions of the seminar was made. One session occurred before the micro-lab and one after. Each session was video taped. Observations and analysis were made of each session based upon having watched the session in actual progress and also later viewing the video tapes. The observations, analysis and judgements about each session was made by a panel of three persons, the author and two members of the Counseling Center staff. The author and one other panel member were present at each session. The third member of the panel viewed only the video tapes. The observations and conclusions reached by this panel are present below.

### I. Group Participation

#### (First Session)

Participation may take several forms. Two of the most obvious are talking and listening. A person may participate in the group by actively expressing himself verbally. However, active participation may also be exhibited by "interested" listening. Most of the discussions observed in the first session were between three individuals, leaving four persons not talking. However, it can be seen that they were not listening either. In short, the first session failed to elicit

the participation of four individuals.

One explanation is that members of the seminar group felt the discussion was not worthwhile and thus were not motivated to participate in it. This conclusion is somewhat substantiated by the questionnaire given after each of the sessions. The results of that questionnaire indicate that in this first session those who actively participated (i.e. talked) rated the session as more worthwhile, while those who were not active, the majority, felt the first session was less worthwhile.

#### (Third Session)

The overall level of participation by the members of the seminar increased in the third session compared to the first session. More people were speaking, but more importantly, when a person was speaking the others were actively listening. The group seemed more relaxed, much freer and more open. This allowed the members to enter the discussion when they felt like saying something, thus making the session more spontaneous. It appears that everyone, except one person, was actively involved throughout the session. Everyone was interacting and aware of themselves as part of a group and not as a collection of isolated individuals.

## II. Discussions on a Personal Level

#### (First Session)

Discussions, in general, tended to be on an impersonal level. Points of view and topics were discussed in "objective" or "analytical" terms. That is, the "problems," or topics, were discussed as if they were devoid of any connection with people. This approach enables the "problems" to be discussed in an "ivory tower" way. It does not become necessary for the discussants to become personally involved, or to expose themselves. If they state an opinion which is drawn from outside themselves, any rebuttal to their statement is not an attack upon their personally held views or beliefs, but rather an attack upon the other person's. By using the impersonal approach the student can manipulate the "problems" (usually of other people) with impunity to any threat to himself. This approach does not promote the students exploring the testing of his own beliefs, but rather, it hinders that process.

The impersonal, objective or analytical approach to discussing "problems" does not, I feel, promote true understanding of the "real world" nor will it add to the students ability to work effectively in it. Both are purposes of the planning education.

(Third Session)

In general, the discussion was more on a personal level. People talked directly to each other, using

first names and addressing their comments to other individuals (this was very seldom done in the first session). They openly expressed conflicting viewpoints, becoming personally involved in the conflict. The apparent openness of the session contributed to the free exchange of personal ideas, opinions and information. There was more exposure and testing of individual views than before. However, only one person openly displayed the fact that he was translating the discussion into personal terms.

### III. A Coherent Theme

#### (First Session)

The net effect of the first session was as if the participants had been brought into a room, each knowing only the general topic, and asked to say something about it without having any knowledge of what others had said previously. Almost everytime someone spoke the specific topic or at least the mood (the level of communication) was changed. Comments seemed disconnected or out-of-joint. Clearly, the students were not "communicating" with each other.

There were probably several causes for the lack of communication. It may have been due to the lack of any real "structure" for the session; however, additional structure would not add to the value of the discussion.

It would only regulate the topic of discussion, not the content of the discussion.

The poor quality of communication may also have resulted from a lack of real personal involvement on the part of the members of the group. Or it may have resulted from the members failing to really listen, to others and themselves. In reality, the causes were probably many more than those named here and certainly more complex than this comment indicates. However, the panel of judges felt that the lack of personal involvement and most of all the members not listening to each other were two major contributors to the poor quality of this session.

The lack of personal involvement relates directly back to the first two points made in this analysis. Another facet becomes more apparent here. The members were extremely dependent upon outside information. By this it is meant that they seldom related to others what they thought or personally felt, but rather quoted from articles or other "authorities." This does not mean to devalue sources of information outside the group. But, this information must often be translated, by the student, into something which relates to him personally, in order for it to be really meaningful. He must put something of himself into what he says and what others say. In order to do this the student must be involved per-

sonally. When this happens the student will be far more likely and capable of more frequent and substantial learning.

Probably the greatest barrier to effective communication, and hence learning, is our inability, or unwillingness, to listen. In a group setting only one person will usually be speaking at any given time, while the other members of that group should be listening. This was not the case in the first session. Some individuals were, rather than listening, preparing for their next statement, others were gazing about the room trying to find something to keep themselves occupied, while still others were simply "somewhere else." Very few were "actively" listening.

As planners, we must become accustomed to listening, listening in the fullest sense, to others around us. If the seminar group had been really listening to themselves, they would have recognized that their discussion was rather shallow, incoherent and to a large part meaningless.

#### (Third Session)

The entire third session followed a coherent theme. The general topic was followed and almost all comments by individuals related to that topic. It appeared that each individual of the group was "actively" listening and therefore when he commented he could relate his points directly and understandably to the comments of others. The group seemed more aware of where they were in the discussion and thus could stay on the topic better.

When the discussion would tend to stray from the topic the group recognized it and would correct themselves. When extraneous comments were made the group sort of skipped over them and continued in a manner more relevant to the topic. When excessive outside information was brought into the discussion, the way it had been throughout the first session, the discussion seemed dampened for a short while and then the group would revive it. It was almost as though the group was saying to the person introducing the information, "Don't do that!" The group seemed to sense what was happening and then would correct it. At the beginning of the session some individuals were introducing "outside" information, but as the session progressed they gradually quit doing this and began introducing the information through themselves, in a personal way. The group pressure upon the individuals was apparently a main force in making this change. Through this sense of "groupness," acting as a group, the session elicited the members active participation and thus improved their ability to maintain a coherent theme.

#### IV. Recognition of Values and Perspectives

(First Session)

Planners are by-and-large a middle class professional group with outlooks and values peculiar to themselves. The seminar group exhibited this middle class professional

outlook. But, nowhere during the session did the group take note of their own peculiar values, the perspectives from which they were viewing things. The topic of the seminar session dealt with minority groups and any minority group usually will not be either middle class nor professional. Therefore, it should have been recognized that minority groups view things from a different perspective and hold differing values. A group's peculiar perspectives and values must be taken into account in discussing, or dealing with, "planning problems" and social issues.

Problems become more apparent and real when viewed from the perspective of those whom the problem directly affects. Only by the planner listening to what his "client" is really saying and feeling can the planner develop an empathy for and an understanding of his "client's" problems. (It seems to me essential that the planner be able to develop empathy for those he seeks to help." Only by seeing a problem through the eyes of his "client" can he fully comprehend it. In the education of a planner this phase should not be overlooked. The educational process should rather foster and develop the students' ability to recognize his own perspectives and values and encourage him to recognize the perspectives and values of others.

(Third Session)

In the third session the group showed a greater ability

to listen and by listening became more aware of value differences within the group. The group seemed to recognize that listening is crucial, that it is the key to understanding someone else's values and perspectives.

This awareness of the importance of listening to each other was carried over into their discussion of minority groups. They were aware that there were value differences between Blacks and themselves. They recognized that they could not be Black.

It appears they were approaching a degree of awareness that it is not sufficient to know simply that there are different values involved, but that it is necessary to listen, to really discover what those differences are.

#### V. Attempts to Summarize

(First Session)

The group made no attempt to summarize, either in part or in whole, what the discussion in the first session had meant. If this had been done possibly the discussion would not have wandered so much. But it seems there is something deeper in the lack of summarization. If the group would have attempted to summarize what had been said it would have indicated that they were actively looking for the "thread" of meaning that tied everything together. They would have been skipping over the rhetoric and getting at the deeper

meaning of the discussion. It would also have indicated that the group was at some point sort of sitting back and looking at themselves and asking, "Where have we been?," "Where are we now?" and "Where are we going?." I would have indicated that the group had become conscious of the communication and the group dynamics involved in their interaction.

(Third Session)

In the third session attempts were made to summarize and synthesize the discussion in parts, although they were somewhat meager. No attempt was made to summarize the whole session. The attempts to summarize reflect that the group was aware of the trends in the discussion and was looking for that "common thread" of meaning. They were, at least in some instances, sitting back and taking a look at themselves and trying to relate the discussion to the topic and themselves personally.

A major contributing factor to the attempted summarizations was probably the result of the group being more aware of what had been and was being said. This increased awareness of content, trend and meaning, of the discussion, relates directly to the fact that the members of the seminar listened.

CONCLUSIONS of this study.

This study clearly indicates that the third session contained greater personal interaction and the groups' ability to listen was greater. Both of these points contributed to a more effective seminar. Also, by virtue of the fact that there was greater personal interaction and listening, it suggests that the group had, to some extent, an increased knowledge of the communication process.

It can further be concluded that the major intervening factor between the first session and the third session was the micro-lab. Although two weeks passed from the micro-lab and the taping of the third session only one class session occurred. Since the group was diverse and did not interact, as a group, outside the seminar sessions, it is unlikely that other significant factors may have intervened and affected the behavior of the group. Therefore, it can be concluded that the major factor which altered the behavior of the group was the micro-lab.

In general, the third session was judged to have been superior to the first. This judgement is substantiated by both the participant's responses on the questionnaire and the observations of the panel of observers. The conclusion that the microlab was the major factor contri-

buting to this improvement, supports the general purpose of this study. It demonstrates that the addition of the micro-lab, or a similar teaching technique, to the planning educational process, for the purpose of teaching communication skills, would be of heuristic value. Its primary value would be that it would better enable the student to work effectively, after his graduation, in the planning profession. But a secondary benefit would be the improvement in the quality of the courses in which the student participated while in school.

1. It would be beneficial to use the teaching of the communication process and group dynamics in the classroom. It would help in dealing with people - a necessary and important part of planning.

2. I feel the most important place for teaching this subject would be in a seminar-type class. This would allow for greater freedom to adapt the subject and teaching method to the specific group involved.

3. The teaching technique used should be something similar to the micro-lab. However, many different types of techniques are available and the specific one chosen should depend upon the desired results, the group involved and the availability of a qualified instructor.

4. To use a teaching technique such as the micro-lab will require that a person specially qualified be available to

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The following list of recommendations have resulted in large part from the results of this study. However, they are wholly the opinions of the author and therefore do reflect personal bias and judgement. They are intended for suggestive purposes only, but it is hoped that they will foster further investigation and thought about teaching methods and content in the planning curriculum.

1. It would be beneficial to add the teaching of the communication process and group dynamics to the curriculum. I feel it would be most beneficial to the student for it would help him in dealing with people - a necessary and important part of planning.
2. I feel the most logical place to teach this subject would be in a seminar type class. This would allow the greater freedom needed to adapt the subject and teaching method to the specific group involved.
3. The teaching technique used should be something similar to the micro-lab. However, many different type of techniques are available and the specific one choosen in any case will depend upon the desired results, the group involved and the availability of a qualified instructor.
4. To use a teaching technique such as the micro-lab will require that a person specially qualified be available to

conduct the sessions. Such people are available on this campus, however, arrangements should be made to use the same person as much as possible. Therefore, it might be of some advantage to have such a person on the planning faculty part time. This would allow greater use of this persons abilities by allowing him to devote more time to the planning department and its concerns. I would think, for example, that it would be beneficial if he would be available on a regular basis for consultation with faculty members, possibly periodic meeting with the full faculty so that they might discuss specific problems and solutions.

5. I would think that more benefit, on the part of the student, would result from a continuous seminar than from a simple semester. Specifically, I mean seminars each semester for every student, one seminar for the first year students and one for the second year students. If these would develop as I would hope they would, the one for the second year students would require little supervision by the faculty. (As an example I refer to the present seminar.) This would help the student to become better acquainted with his fellow students in the first year and would later provide him with a continuing outlet to test and explore his own knowledge of planning, personal values and biases. It would also provide a logical tool by

which guest speakers may be introduced. But more importantly it would provide a means by which the faculty may interact with the students on something other than the teacher student relationship.

6. During these seminars the teaching of some communication skills and interaction skills can be taught. I would think that possibly at the beginning of each year, or semester, would be a good place for such a thing. However, it should depend upon the changes within the group and the groups desires at that particular time. It would also depend upon what the desired results were. In any case, what I am thinking of would be for the group specialist to simply conduct the first two or three class sessions. This would allow the establishment of the proper group atmosphere before beginning the subject content of the seminar.

7. This same method could be applied to other courses either through the group specialist or by the teacher while conferring with the group specialist. In this case as well, I feel, the first few class periods should be devoted to preparing the way for more meaningful and worthwhile discussions later when the subject matter of the course is introduced.

## APPENDIX I

### SUGGESTED CURRICULUM OUTLINE

1st Semester (15 hour block, all within the  
Planning Dept.) (16 week semester)

Subjects: General Planning History-5 weeks  
Communicative Skills -3 weeks  
Planning Techniques -6 weeks  
The Planning Profession -2 weeks

2nd Semester (15 hours taken outside of the  
Dept. in the students area of specialization)

Generalist-Administrator Speciality-

Urban Politics or Psych. of Politics	-3 hours
Const. Law or Civil Liberties	-3 hours
Community Organization or Social Psych.	-3 hours
Primary Groups or Seminar in Small Groups	-3 hours
Seminar in Planning	-3 hours
Total Hours	<u>15 hours</u>

3rd Semester (15 hour block, all within the Plann-  
ing Dept.) (16 week semester)

Subjects: Advanced Communicative Skills -3 weeks  
Advanced Planning Theory -3 weeks  
Advanced Planning Techniques -4 weeks  
Planning Office Administration-2 weeks  
The Planning Process -2 weeks  
Planning Implimentation -2 weeks

4th Semester (6-15 hours consisting of thesis  
and further specialization)

Research in Planning (thesis)	-3-6 hours
Seminar in Planning	- 3 hours
Electives	<u>-6-9 hours</u>
Total Hours	<u>9-15 hours</u>

Electives for Generalist-Administrator

Human Relations (Home Ec.)  
Oral Comm 2 (Speech)  
Persuasion (Speech)

## Electives (con't)

Personnel (Commerce)  
 Office Management (Commerce)  
 Advanced Management (Commerce)  
 Business and Society (Commerce)  
 Business Operations Analysis (Commerce)  
 Public Relations (Journalism)  
 Community Organization and Leadership (Soc.)  
 Intro. Cultural Anthropology (Soc.)  
 Social Problems (Soc.)  
 Industrial Sociology (Soc.)  
 Primary Groups (Soc.)  
 Seminar in Small Groups (Soc.)  
 Social Psych. (Psych.)  
 Urban Politics (Pol. Sci.)  
 Constitutional Law (Pol. Sci.)  
 Civil Liberties (Pol. Sci.)  
 American Government (Pol. Sci.)  
 American Urban History (History)

## APPENDIX II

The following information is provided to give the reader some indication of the definition and purpose of the micro-lab, as used in this study, as opposed to the encounter group. It must be pointed out that the information presented below does not fully nor adequately present the content, purpose and definition of either type of group.

The encounter group, variously called T-group, lab group and sensitivity training, consists of approximately four to twenty people brought together for the purpose of "sensitivity training." The session may last from one weekend to several weeks. Dr. Carl Rogers summarizes the encounter group in two ways; from the individual's perspective:

That in an intensive group, with much freedom and little structure, the individual will gradually feel safe enough to drop some of his defenses and facades; that he will relate more directly on a feeling basis (come to basic encounter) with other members of the group; will come to understand himself and his relationship to others more accurately; that he will change in his personal attitudes and behavior; that he will subsequently relate more effectively to others in his everyday life situation!

and from the perspective of the group:

...in this situation of minimal structure

the group will move from confusions, fractionation, and discontinuity to a climate of greater trust and coherence.<sup>2</sup>

The micro-lab contrasts to the encounter group in that its specific purpose, structure, duration and the role of the leader are different. The leader plays a more active and directive role. The micro-lab is more structured. It is of shorter duration, generally a few hours. And although its general purpose remains much the same its specific purpose is quite different. It is "...intended to facilitate the beginning stages of relationship in small groups of people with no significant prior experience with each other," "...it operates solely to facilitate initial stages of group process."<sup>3</sup> The micro-lab should normally be followed-up by further experiences, such as the encounter group. However, it may be justified as an end in itself when it is used to provide a demonstration of group process, or when it is used to study some aspect of group process.<sup>4</sup> The later two exceptions being the case in this study.

Again, it must be stressed that the foregoing material is extremely inadequate and oversimplified. For a valid and useable explanation of either the

encounter group or the micro-lab the reader should refer to more authoritative sources.

---

Footnotes:

1. Rogers, Carl R., The Process of the Basic Encounter Group, Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, La Jolla, California, (no date), p.p. 23, p.2.

2. Ibid.

3. Edelman, Sheldon K., The Micro-lab in Communication; Theory and Technique, Counseling Center, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, unpublished paper, 1968, p.p. 8, p. 1.

4. Ibid.