MODELS OF GROUP DEVELOPMENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL GROUP WORK PRACTICE

JAMES K. WHITTAKER

University of Washington

While generally underdeveloped, some areas of social group work theory have an abundance of models which tend to confuse rather than clarify matters for the practitioner. This paper takes one such area—small-group development—and attempts to integrate existing formulations into the five-stage model suggested by Garland, Jones, and Kolodny. Practice implications are developed for each of the five stages in terms of the three overall models for social group work practice: the social-goals model, the remedial model, and the reciprocal model.

In 1960, Robert Vinter said of the then nascent state of group work practice principles:

Despite the profession's intense interest in methods and techniques of practice, and the large literature on practice, there has been very little analysis of the processes of formulating practice principles. Anyone undertaking this task enters relatively uncharted territory and can be expected to do little more than identify the major peaks and valleys [54:4].

In ten years, the body of group work practice principles has grown so much that, at least in some areas, the group work practitioner is faced with an abundance, rather than with a scarcity, of guidelines for practice. One such well-developed area is that of small-group development, in which a number of different models have been proposed, each with its accompanying implications for practice. The result has been that the group work practitioner often finds himself as disillusioned with the "affluence" of too many practice models —often with overlapping categories and different terminology for the same phenomena—as he was with the "poverty" of too few.

It is the thesis of this paper that the five-stage model for group development proposed by Garland, Jones, and Ko-lodny represents the most complete statement to date on the subject and contains within its stages the basic elements of the models proposed by the other major contributors to the social work literature in this area (8).[1] The purpose of this paper, then, will be twofold: (*a*) to integrate the other major practice formulations of group development into the model suggested by Garland, Jones, and Kolodny, and (*b*) to develop implications for practice for each of the stages of development, on the basis of the three overall models of social group work practice: the social-goals model, the remedial model, and the reciprocal model (31).

CURRENT MODELS OF GROUP DEVELOPMENTS

The knowledge base for group development draws from small-group sociology, social psychology, group psychotherapy, human relations, and social work.[2] Researchers in these areas have

[1] See Kindelsperger (16), Maier (26), Sarri and Galinsky (38), and Trecker (49).

[2] For an introduction to the subject see Cartwright and Zander (6), Hare (12), Hare, Borgatta, and Bales (13), Homans (14), Lewin (23), Lippitt (24), Mann (28), Martin and Hill (29), Psathas (36), Redl (37), Scheidlinger (39), and Theodorson (47).

308

provided many studies that illustrate the general cycles and phases through which groups seem to progress. In general, most theorists look upon group development as a series of phases through which all small groups progress, or at least as some sort of recurring cycle of member attraction based on different factors.[3] For example, Bales and Strodtbeck have suggested three phases of development in problem-solving groups: orientation, evaluation, and control, with each of these assuming prominence at any one given point in time (2).

In the literature of social group work, we find a number of studies of group development. Only the more fully developed of these models—those of Maier, Kindelsperger, Trecker, and Sarri and Galinsky—will be considered in terms of how they may be integrated with the Garland, Jones, and Kolodny formulation.[4]

Henry Maier has proposed four phases through which small groups progress: locating commonness, creating exchange, developing mutual identification, and developing group identification. Maier chooses not to look upon termination as a phase of group development, but otherwise his scheme most closely resembles the Garland, Jones, and Kolodny model in its essential components.

Kindelsperger has suggested a six-stage model of group development consisting of the following phases: ap-

proach or orientation, relationship negotiation or conflict, group role emergence, vacillating group role dominance, group role dominance, and institutionalized group roles. This formulation, while helpful in some respects, appears to be too inadequately developed to be of any substantial benefit to the practitioner. For example, we are told: "No group ever fits exactly into these categories and all groups do not go through all of the stages," without being told why this is so. Similarly, the author says little about the character of worker intervention at each stage of development and leaves us only with the rather tenuous statement that "it is risky to bypass the stages and to force movement ahead." It is not made clear why this is necessarily so.

Trecker has also proposed a six-stage model for group development that is more behaviorally descriptive than the others. It consists of the following stages: beginning stage; emergence of some group feeling, organization, program; development of bond, purpose, and cohesiveness; strong group feeling—goal attainment; decline in interest—less group feeling; and ending stage, or decision to discontinue the group. Like Bernstein, Trecker suggests a number of key indices which the worker can use in determining the group's stage of development.

One of the best theoretically developed and well-articulated statements of group development has been offered by Rosemary Sarri and Maeda Galinsky. Unlike the other formulations, theirs derives from an analysis of small-group research, primarily in sociology and group psychotherapy. This model of development is congruent with Vinter's conception of the group as both the means and the context for treatment

[3] Homans, for example, posits such recurring and reciprocal cycles, with activity, interaction, and sentiment being the essential basis for formation (14).

[4] The author is well aware of the important contributions of Austin (1), Bernstein (4), Northen (30), Paradise (32), Shalinsky (43), and Thomas and Fink (48) to our knowledge of group development, but these materials will not be considered here.

(52). The Sarri and Galinsky model, which rests upon four basic assumptions,[5] consists of seven distinct phases:

1. *Origin phase.* This phase refers to the composition of the group and is distinguished primarily for analytic purposes, since it is at least a precondition for later development.

2. *Formative phase.* The initial activity of the group members in seeking similarity and mutuality of interests is the outstanding characteristic of this phase. Initial commitments to group purpose, emergent personal ties, and a quasi-group structure are also observable.

3. *Intermediate phase I.* This phase is characterized by a moderate level of group cohesion, clarification of purposes, and observable involvement of members in goal-directed activities.

4. *Revision phase.* This phase is characterized by challenges to the existing group structure and an accompanying modification of group purposes and operating procedures.

5. *Intermediate phase II.* Following the revision phase, while many groups progress toward maturation, the characteristics outlined in Intermediate phase I may again appear, though the group generally manifests a higher level of integration and stability than in the earlier phase.

6. *Maturation phase.* This phase is characterized by stabilization of group structure, group purpose, operating and governing procedures, expansion of the culture of the group, and the existence of effective responses to internal and external stress.

[5] The group is a potent influence system and can be used as an efficient vehicle for individual change. The group is not an end in itself. Group development can be controlled and influenced by the worker's actions. There is no optimal way in which groups develop.

7. *Termination phase.* The dissolution of the group may result from goal attainment, maladaptation, lack of integration, or previously made plans about the duration of the group.

The writers go on to develop a series of strategies for each of the phases. Despite the theoretical sophistication of the model, it appears to fall short in its description of what is happening to the members in each of the phases, as contrasted to the richly descriptive material offered by Garland, Jones, and Kolodny. In fairness to the authors, it should be noted that their main reason for omitting descriptions of individual member reactions was that several writers in the past had failed to distinguish worker intervention and individual client reaction from the group developmental processes. One wishes that the authors had made such a distinction and then gone on to describe both the group developmental processes and the reactions of individual members, as well as the strategies of worker intervention. In addition, the Sarri and Galinsky model contains no "real life" group-process examples, in sharp contrast to the highly illustrative examples integrated into the Garland formulation.

Finally, the names of the different stages in the Sarri and Galinsky model, while certainly in keeping with the research studies from which they were derived, sound somewhat as if they were contrived strictly for taxonomic purposes. The Garland model, on the other hand, employs, in describing its stages, a rich "central theme" approach which seems to have more overall benefit for the practitioner. Despite these few shortcomings, the Sarri and Galinsky model constitutes a distinct and significant contribution to the group work literature, particularly in terms of its

scientifically based descriptions of group structure and processes.

GARLAND, JONES, AND KOLODNY: FIVE STAGES OF GROUP DEVELOPMENT

This five-stage model of group development was derived from an analysis of group-process records at a children's agency over a three-year period. It is solid in its theoretical underpinnings, well articulated, and richly exampled with group-process materials. It offers the most advanced statement in the literature concerning worker focus at each of the various stages. The authors have identified the five stages in terms of the central theme characteristic of each. They are as follows:[6]

1. *Pre-affiliation*. "Closeness" of the members is the central theme in this stage, with "approach-avoidance" as the major early struggle in relation to it. Ambivalence toward involvement is reflected in the members' vacillating responses to program activities and events. Relationships are usually non-intimate, and a good deal of use may be made of rather stereotypic activity as a means of getting acquainted.

2. *Power and control*. After making the decision that the group is potentially rewarding, members move to a stage during which issues of power, control, status, skill, and decision-making are the focal points. There is likely to be a testing of the group worker and the members, as well as an attempt to define and formalize relationships and to define a status hierarchy. Three basic issues are suggested by the power-struggle phenomena: rebellion and autonomy, permission and the normative crisis, and protection and support.

[6] This necessarily brief description of the five stages does not do justice to the full and intricate job done by the authors (8).

3. *Intimacy*. This stage is characterized by intensification of personal involvement, more willingness to bring into the open feelings about club members and group leader, and a striving for satisfaction of dependency needs. Siblinglike rivalry tends to appear, as well as overt comparison of the group to family life. There is a growing ability to plan and carry out group projects and a growing awareness and mutual recognition of the significance of the group experience in terms of personality growth and change.

4. *Differentiation*. In this stage, members begin to accept one another as distinct individuals and to see the social worker as a unique person and the group as providing a unique experience. Relationships and needs are more reality based, communication is good, and there is strong cohesion. As clarification of power relationships gave freedom for autonomy and intimacy, so clarification of and coming to terms with intimacy and mutual acceptance of personal needs brings freedom and ability to differentiate and to evaluate relationships and events in the group on a reality basis. The group experience achieves a functionally autonomous character in this fourth stage. In freeing perceptions of the situation from distortions of extraneous experience and in creating its unique institutions and mores, the group becomes, in a sense, its own frame of reference.

5. *Separation*. The group experience has been completed, and the members may begin to move apart and find new resources for meeting social, recreational, and vocational needs. The following reactions have been observed repeatedly in groups in the process of termination: denial, regression, recapitulation of past experiences, evaluation,

flight, and pleas from the members who say, "We still need the group."

The way in which these different models of group development may be integrated is best represented in tabular form (Chart 1). It should be noted that a relationship of exact equality between the various stages is not being proposed. It is simply suggested that the stages of

closest to the "Pre-affiliation" stage in the Garland model. Generally speaking, the stages in the other models continue to run in their normal sequence when placed alongside the Garland model, with some stages collapsed for purposes of clarity.

What is suggested here should in no sense be taken as a complete synthesis

CHART 1

INTEGRATED STAGE MODEL OF GROUP DEVELOPMENT

Garland, Jones, and Kolodny	PARALLEL STAGES OF GROUP DEVELOPMENT			
	Maier	Sarri and Galinsky	Kindelsperger	Trecker
I. Pre-affilia-tion	1. Locating com-monness	1. Origin 2. Formative	1. Approach-orienta-tion	1. Beginning
II. Power and control	2. Creating ex-change	3. Intermediate I 4. Revision	2. Relationship nego-tiation or conflict	. . . .
III. Intimacy	3. Developing mu-tual identifica-tion	5. Intermediate II	3. Group role emer-gence 4. Vacillating group role dominance	2. Emergence of some group "feeling," or-ganization
IV. Differen-tiation	4. Developing group identifi-cation	6. Maturation	5. Group role domi-nance 6. Institutionalized group roles	3. Development of bond, purpose, co-hesiveness 4. Strong group feel-ing—goal attain-ment
V. Separation	. . . .	7. Termination	. . . .	5. Decline in interest, less group feeling 6. Ending stage: deci-sion to discontinue the group

development in the other models most nearly approximate those offered by Garland, Jones, and Kolodny in the manner indicated. For example, Sarri and Galinsky's "Intermediate I" and "Revision" phases can rather easily be subsumed under the heading of "Power and control." In fact, they add greatly to the description of what is happening to group structure at this particular stage. Similarly, Maier's phase of "Lo-cating commonness" appears to be

of the various models. It is this writer's belief that such a synthesis would create more problems for the practitioner than it would solve, for it would create new stages of group development, which would require, among other things, a new set of terms to describe the various phases. To an area of practice theory already burdened with too much am-biguous terminology, the addition of another set of stages would run counter to fundamental canons of parsimony.

What is suggested here is that the other models of group development may be used selectively to complement the Garland model. It can be argued that in specific areas—for example, in descriptions of group structure and processes—the Garland model can be significantly enhanced by some of the other formulations—in this case, by the model offered by Sarri and Galinsky. Overall, however, it must be noted that the five-stage model offers the most complete statement in the social work literature, and, far from being contradicted, it is actually supported to a large extent by the other models of group development.

MODELS OF SOCIAL GROUP WORK PRACTICE

It is evident that the implications for practice of the five stages of group development will vary according to the overall model for practice utilized by the worker. The author will attempt to show how implications for practice will differ in relation to the three models of group work practice proposed by Papell and Rothman: the social-goals model, the remedial model, and the reciprocal model (31). Only a brief description of each will be outlined here, and the reader is directed to Papell and Rothman for a more complete development.[7]

1. *The social-goals model.* This model of social group work does not exist as a single formulation in the literature, nor does it owe its existence to a central theoretician who has systematically set forth all of its elements. It is, as Papell and Rothman state, a model that has its origins in the earliest traditions of social group work practice. The social-goals model envisages social change brought about by responsible members of groups within society. The principle of democratic group process that is fundamental to this model has become a cornerstone of all social group work practice. Perhaps the leading current exponent of the social-goals model is Hyman Wiener, who states that social responsibility and social identity can be achieved only through scientific projects that must be chosen according to the location of the group worker in the agency, the distribution of power within the agency and community, and the time dimension. Wiener's approach utilizes social-systems theory, and he borrows strategies from Chin and Lippitt in seeking points within society vulnerable to change (56).[8]

2. *The remedial model.* The remedial, or treatment, model of social group work is primarily concerned with the remediation of problems of psychological, social, and cultural adjustment through the use of a selected group experience. The group is viewed as both the "means and the context" for treatment by Vinter, who has outlined five phases in the treatment sequence: intake, diagnosis and treatment planning, group composition and formation, group development and treatment, and evaluation and termination (52).

The remedial model was influenced early by the clinical work of Fritz Redl and David Wineman and by the writings of Gisela Konopka, whose *Therapeutic Group Work with Children* (22) did much to establish group work as a full-fledged clinical modality.[9]

[7] For an insightful view of the historical development of the three models see Jones (15).

[8] See also Ginsberg and Goldberg (9), Wiener (57), and the early writings of Cohen, Coyle, Ginsberg, Kaiser, Klein, Miller, Phillips, and Wilson. For an excellent view of the values underlying the social-goals model see Konopka (20).

[9] See also Blum (5), Glasser (11), Kolodny (17), Kolodny and Burns (18), Konopka (19, 21), Maier (27), and Vinter (52).

3. *The reciprocal model.* Unlike the other models of social group work, the reciprocal model has been most closely associated with a single theoretician, William Schwartz. The theoretical base for the reciprocal model derives largely from systems theory and from field theory. Indeed, Schwartz seems to make the point that the system within which the method is practiced should be considered first and that one cannot properly speak of the "group work" method as such. "It seems more accurate," he writes, "to speak of a social work method practiced in the various systems in which the social worker finds himself, or which are established for the purpose of giving service: the family, the small friendship group, the representative body, the one-to-one interview, the hospital ward, the committee, etc." (41).

Since goal-setting is an intrinsic part of the client-worker relationship, it is meaningless, in the view of the reciprocal theorist, to speak about the worker's goals for the client as if they were autonomous, independent entities. Since there are initially no specific social or therapeutic goals, emphasis is placed on engagement in interpersonal relationships. The worker carries out his function if he focuses on the symbiotic interdependence of the client and society and attempts to mediate between the two.[10]

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

To summarize, this paper has attempted to integrate several models of small-group development from the social group work literature with the five-stage model suggested by Garland, Jones, and Kolodny. In addition, a brief

[10] See also Polsky (34, 35), Schwartz (40, 42), Shulman (44), and Tropp (51). For an introduction to systems theory see Bennis, Benne, and Chin (3), Lippitt (24), and Parsons (33).

outline of the three overall models of social group work practice, as developed by Papell and Rothman, has been provided. The final section of the paper is an attempt to develop strategies of intervention for each of the five stages of group development in relation to the three overall models of group work practice. These strategies of intervention will be consonant with the major requirements for the development of practice principles in social work, as outlined by Vinter (54).

Vinter has identified four major requirements for the development of practice principles in social work:

1. Practice principles must specify or refer to the desired ends of action, the changed states of being in which it is intended that effective action will result.

2. Practice principles must incorporate the ethical principles, commitments, and values which prescribe and circumscribe professional activity.

3. Practice principles should incorporate valid knowledge about the most important phenomena or events with which professional workers are concerned.

4. Practice principles should direct the professional worker toward certain types of action, which, if engaged in, are likely to achieve the desired ends or goals (54).

Vinter's criticism of the group work literature is that it tends to be valuative and ideological, rather than instrumental. That is, it stresses the larger ends toward which practice should be directed, while it seems relatively uncertain about specific means toward particular objectives. The following implications for practice will, in the main, adhere to the criteria advanced by Vinter, with some slight alteration of the

second criterion concerning the identi-
fication and incorporation of values.

Jones has analyzed the three models
of social group work practice in terms
of group purposes, type of service, role
of worker, image of group member,
activities, requisite worker skills, and
theory base (Chart 2). It is the view of
this writer that the overall values are

the action, as well as the means for
achieving those ends, he has, in the very
process, made a statement of value pref-
erence. Therefore, outside of a state-
ment of the general goals of the group
or individual client, and in addition to
the set of ethics which the profession
holds in common, any further statement
of values is superfluous and may even

CHART 2

MODELS OF SOCIAL GROUP WORK PRACTICE*

	Social-Goals Model	Remedial Model	Reciprocal Model
Purpose of group	Social consciousness and social responsibility	To remedy social dysfunctioning by specific behavioral change	To achieve a mutual aid system; initially, no specific goals
Type of service	Socialization and consumptive services	Integration and adaptive services	Adaptive, socialization, integrative and consumptive services
Role of worker	Enabler	Change agent	Mediator or resource person
Image of group member	Participating citizens and indigenous leaders	Deviants, to at least some degree	Ego vis-à-vis alter
Types of activity	Wide range of activities and tasks, including those of community organization	Use of direct and indirect means of influence, including extragroup means	Engagement of group members in process of interpersonal relations
Requisite worker skills	In programming	In intervention in group process to achieve specified goals	In definition and dialogue
Theory base	Eclectic theory base	Social role theory, sociobehavioral theory, ego psychology, group dynamics	Systems theory and field theory

* See Jones (15).

implied in the group purposes for each
of the three models. Beyond these gen-
eral statements, the practice implica-
tions, or action principles, contain, at
least implicitly, value components of
their own. Put even more simply, what
the worker does defines the value ori-
entation and ethical structure he is op-
erating within in relation to his clients.[11]
In effect, then, if the social work theore-
tician has specified the desired ends of

be misleading. In short, one may judge
the value component of any practice
principle by what it says to do, rather
than by why it says to do it.

Action strategies will be suggested for
each of the five stages of group develop-
ment under each of the three overall
models of group work practice.

[11] For a further statement of how theoretical ori-
entation influences philosophical outlook see Maier
(25).

STAGE I: PRE-AFFILIATION

Social-goals model. The worker makes a special attempt to identfy and involve indigenous community leaders in the group and uses program for the purpose of acquainting group members with and involving them in the process of democratic participation. This is achieved, for example, in the worker's approach toward resolving decision issues, such as when the group should meet, and where.

Remedial model. The worker provides an orientation to the group, outlines its purposes, and establishes a treatment "contract" with the members. A well-structured—and a worker-controlled—program allows for distance among the members, while it provides opportunities for exploration and invites trust. Activities that require a high degree of facilitative interdependence are passed over in favor of those that allow for parallel participation of the members.

Reciprocal model. The worker begins to explore with the group the common elements that bind the members together, as well as those that separate them. The worker may suggest, but not insist upon, various program activities that will help to lay the basis for a mutual-aid system in the group. Through clarification, he helps the group to articulate common needs and explore possible group actions to meet those needs. He is not nearly as directive or controlling as the worker in the remedial model, but he may mediate between the demands of a larger social system (for example, the agency) and the needs of the individual group members.

STAGE II: POWER AND CONTROL

Social-goals model. The worker encourages all members of the client group

to participate in decision-making but, essentially, he must go along with the group's decision about the leadership structure and work with those leaders who seem to have the support of the majority of the group members. Ideally, if he has been successful in laying the groundwork for democratic participation (in Stage I), then the leaders chosen will most likely be representative of the total group.

Functioning as an enabler, he makes his expertise in social action techniques and strategies available to the group members, but does not attempt to formulate objectives for the group. He may, at times, suggest specific action strategies, which will test the ability of the leadership to muster the support of the members in attempting to secure a specific objective. The task of policy-making, however, clearly rests with the members.

Remedial model. While allowing for a certain amount of member rebellion and power struggle, the worker acts in his capacity of group executive and controller of membership roles to forestall the crystallization of any power take-over by a particular clique or subgroup. Sarri and Galinsky speak of maintaining the group through the revision stage and, in a similar vein, Garland, Jones, and Kolodny speak of the importance of protecting the safety of the individual members and their physical property. For example, the worker may wish to assign the various roles in activities, choose sides in games, promote low-status members through task assignments, and, generally, exert his influence as group leader to maintain an "open" group structure.

Reciprocal model. The worker strives to clarify the power struggle and to focus again on the function of the group: to provide a mutual-aid system.

In addition, he makes clear that worker, agency, and members are related to each other by certain rules and requirements imposed upon them by the terms of their agreement to come together. Schwartz stresses that any rules for the group should emerge from the function of the group and the necessities of the work, rather than from the personal authority of the helping agent (41). Thus, in terms of his manipulations of the group influence structure at this stage—through direct, personal intervention—the worker's function is considerably less directive than it would be in the remedial model and slightly more directive than it would be in the social-goals model.

STAGE III: INTIMACY

Social-goals model. As the leadership crisis is resolved and the members are more solidly linked together, they will likely raise questions about the worker's role and function within the group. He amplifies his function as consultant on strategy, while disavowing a policy-making role. He also clarifies the growing interdependence among the members and relates this to the ability of the group to attain its stated objectives: "If we stay united, we can achieve success." Finally, he encourages group activities that will reinforce the belief that working together brings results.

Remedial model. The worker supports the group through the emotional turmoil of increased interdependency; he helps the members to sort out and discuss the positive and negative aspects of increased closeness and works with them to clarify how this group is different from the others (family group, peer group) in which they participate. He is constantly on the lookout for opportunities to entrust the members with responsibility, which in the earlier stages he

has reserved for himself. Program is becoming more flexible and is now largely determined by the members themselves. Finally, the worker takes care to allow the group only the amount of program responsibility which it can reasonably handle; specifically, he has some structured activities ready to fall back on if the group seems unable to plan adequately for itself.

Reciprocal model. In this stage, more than any other, the worker strives to "detect and challenge the obstacles which obscure the common ground between the members." Using clarification and confrontation, he may explore with the members those things that are keeping them from accomplishing their present tasks. While the causes of these obstacles may be fantastically complex, the focus of the worker is on dealing with the specific problems they are presently causing for the group. Through the contribution of ideas, facts, and value concepts, the worker helps the members to "see" what is keeping them from their stated objectives. This process may range all the way from having the members voice very specific complaints: "We don't like the way Joe always butts in when somebody else is talking," to discussions of more intricate and detailed misperceptions, or value conflicts: "If we go with you to the community center, then the rest of the kids on the block will think we're 'goodies.'"

STAGE IV: DIFFERENTIATION

Social goals model. In this stage, the group has resolved most of its power problems and has high mutual support among the members, as well as good communication. The worker helps the group to formulate new objectives (as the original social-action goals may have already been attained) and con-

tinues to identify areas of need that might provide a basis for future social action. In carrying out these tasks, the worker takes care not to jeopardize his non-policy-making role. Even in this next-to-the-last stage of the group's development, the worker begins the process of extricating himself from the group, while doing all he can to insure its continued effectiveness by encouraging new members to join and participate.

Remedial model. The worker helps the group to run itself by encouraging individual members to take responsibility for the planning and execution of program activities. With the increased cohesiveness and the heightened sense of the group's special identity as a separate, meaningful influence system, the worker can begin to direct the group toward projects which involve other groups and agencies in the larger community. He is constantly re-evaluating goals for the individual members and seeing how they may be related to the activities of the group at this particular stage. He gets the members to begin evaluation of their group experience in preparation for the group's termination. Typically, this may involve discussion of how the members had worked out some of the problems that they had brought with them to the group in the beginning.

Reciprocal model. With the establishment of a mutual-aid system within the group, the worker helps the members to focus on changes they may wish to make in other systems outside the group. For example, a cottage group in an institution may focus on strategies of intervention designed to get the administration to change its policy on off-campus recreation. The worker uses his skill in definition to make clear when he

is operating in his role as group member and when he is functioning primarily as agency representative. The worker aids the group in relating—while not necessarily adjusting—to its environment and helps the group in its effort to provide satisfaction for its members.

STAGE V: SEPARATION

Social-goals model. In this final stage, the worker aids the group in establishing linkages with other community structures and agencies in order to insure its continued effectiveness after his departure. In short, he tries to prepare the group for the fact of his absence and encourages members to think about new objectives when the original goals of the group have been realized. He may arrange for periodic consultation with the group, but the real test of his success will be made evident when he, literally, has "worked himself out of a job."[12]

Remedial model. The worker helps the group through the process of termination by encouraging evaluation, recapitulation, and review. He is prepared to deal with nihilistic flight, denial, "separation anxiety," repression, and anger of the members that they are losing the group. Using extragroup means of influence, he helps the individual members plan for the meeting of their needs through other resources after the group has disbanded (55). Program is highly mobile and community-oriented and designed to utilize the skills that the members have learned in the group.

Reciprocal model. The worker helps the members to evaluate the process by which they develop the mutual-aid system and encourages them to think about

[12] As one group leader recently stated, "I'll know when I have achieved success, when the community group demands my resignation."

ways in which they can achieve similar need satisfaction in the other systems in which they function. In addition, he works with the members to define the limits of the external situation in which the client-worker system is set and helps the members to determine how they will continue to operate within those limits (or modify them), once the group has been disbanded.

DISCUSSION

In 1962, Paul Glasser called for group work to broaden its theory base and make use of more concepts from the social and psychological sciences (10). Unfortunately, a recent review of group work literature reveals just how little this suggestion has been implemented (45). While it is undeniably true that group work is both art and science, it is equally true that the literature to date has focused much more on the art than on the science. Though some progress has been made, there are still far too few attempts to integrate knowledge from the behavioral sciences in models of practice and still fewer attempts to validate these practice models through empirical research.[13] The net result is that practitioners are too often left without clear guidelines for practice and are forced instead to rely upon their own intuition in decision-making. Without denying the value of intuition in practice, one can legitimately raise the question: "If intuition becomes the only basis for practice, then doesn't practice itself become so idiosyncratic as to preclude even speaking of any group work method?"

[13] One recent empirical study in group work was executed by Feldman (7). See also Trieschman, Whittaker, and Brendtro (50) for an attempt to blend psychoanalytic ego psychology, social learning theory, and Redl's life-space theory into a unified model for milieu treatment.

It is suggested that research in social group work should proceed in at least two directions: First, there should be an attempt to integrate existing practice models (as this paper has tried to do in the area of group development) and to develop implications for practice in terms of some overall conception of group work practice. The Papell and Rothman model, despite its limitations, seems best suited for this purpose, especially as it makes the distinction between remediation and social action. The time is past when group work theoreticians can afford themselves the luxury of developing models for practice without taking into consideration what has taken place before.

Second, a concerted attempt should be made to utilize knowledge from the social and behavioral sciences to inform group work practice theory. This process should involve not merely the transposition of theoretical models from the social sciences, but their empirical testing as well. While social group workers once viewed themselves as the arbiters of all that happened in groups, it is now sad to note that many group modes currently popular in social work (sensitivity training, family group therapy, and guided group interaction) have developed outside the pale of social group work. Unless, it seems to this writer, group work can look beyond its boundaries and at least attempt to incorporate appropriate strategies and techniques from other group modes, group workers will be in the unseemly position of having convinced only themselves of the efficacy of their work.

The practice implications suggested in this paper are clearly not exhaustive, and it is the intention of the author that they be expanded, modified, or discarded according to their utility. Cur-

rent formulations of how small groups develop raise more questions than they answer. What, for example, is the relationship between the worker's intervention and the manner in which the group proceeds through the stages of development? Similarly, to what extent should we think of the various stages as mutually exclusive phases, or as elements which are always present in group life to some degree, but achieve prominence only at certain times? These and other questions remain to be answered. Social group work needs not fixed but flexible theoretical models that can incorporate new practice formulations as they are developed. If this brief paper serves as a first step in that direction, then its purpose will have been well served.

Finally, the ever increasing "haziness" between the traditional methods of casework, group work, and community organization makes it all the more urgent to define and develop a scientifically grounded theory for practice— not to rekindle the old arguments over "what" constitutes casework, or "what" is the role of group work, but in order to develop a unified theory of social work practice, which will include the best elements of each.

Received September 8, 1969

REFERENCES

1. Austin, David M. "Goals for Gang Workers." *Social Work* 2 (October 1957): 43–51.
2. Bales, Robert F., and Strodtbeck, Fred L. "Phases in Group Problem-solving." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 46 (1951): 485–95. Also in Cartwright and Zander (6:624–38).
3. Bennis, Warren; Benne, Kenneth; and Chin, Robert. *The Planning of Change.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.
4. Bernstein, Saul. *Charting Group Progress.* New York: Association Press, 1949.
5. Blum, Arthur. "The Social Group Work Method: One View." In *A Conceptual Framework for Teaching the Social Group Work Method in the Classroom.* New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1964.
6. Cartwright, Dorwin, and Zander, Alvin, eds. *Group Dynamics.* New York: Harper & Row, 1960.
7. Feldman, Ronald A. "Group Integration, Intense Interpersonal Dislike, and Social Group Work Intervention." *Social Work* 14 (July 1969): 30–40.
8. Garland, James; Jones, Hubert; and Kolodny, Ralph. "A Model for Stages of Development in Social Work Groups." In *Explorations in Group Work,* edited by Saul Bernstein, pp. 12–53. Boston: Boston University School of Social Work, 1965.
9. Ginsberg, Mitchell, and Goldberg, Jack. "The Impact of the Current Scene on Group Work Policy and Practice." Summary Presentation: Group Work Section Meetings. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1961–62.
10. Glasser, Paul. "Group Methods in Child Welfare: Review and Preview." In *Group Method and Services in Child Welfare,* pp. 5–11. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1963.
11. ———. "Social Role, Personality, and Group Work Practice." In *Social Work Practice, 1962: Selected Papers from the 89th Annual Forum, National Conference on Social Welfare,* pp. 60–74. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.
12. Hare, A. Paul. *Handbook of Small Group Research.* New York: Free Press, 1965.
13. Hare, A. Paul; Borgatta, Edgar F.; and Bales, Robert F., eds. *Small Groups.* New York: Alfred Knopf, 1961.
14. Homans, George. *The Human Group.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1950.
15. Jones, John F. "Social Group Work Method." Mimeographed. Minneapolis, Minn., 1967.
16. Kindelsperger, Walter L. "Stages in Group Development." In *The Use of the Group in Welfare Settings,* pp. 8–12. New Orleans: Tulane University, 1957.
17. Kolodny, Ralph. "A Group Work Approach to the Isolated Child." *Social Work* 6 (July 1961): 76–84.

18. Kolodny, Ralph L., and Burns, Virginia M. "Group Work with Physically and Emotionally Handicapped Children in a Summer Camp." In *Social Work with Groups, 1958,* pp. 28–50. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1958.

19. Konopka, Gisela. *The Adolescent Girl in Conflict.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

20. ———. *Eduard C. Lindeman and Social Work Philosophy.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958.

21. ———. *Group Work in the Institution.* New York: Association Press, 1954.

22. ———. *Therapeutic Group Work with Children.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949.

23. Lewin, Kurt. *Field Theory in Social Science.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1951.

24. Lippitt, Ronald, et al. *The Dynamics of Planned Change.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1958.

25. Maier, Henry W. "Application of Psychological and Sociological Theory to Teaching Social Work with the Group." *Journal of Education for Social Work* 3 (Spring 1967): 29–41.

26. ———. "Research Project on Group Development." Mimeographed. Seattle: University of Washington School of Social Work, 1961–62.

27. Maier, Henry W., ed. *Group Work as Part of Residential Treatment.* New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1965.

28. Mann, James, "Some Theoretical Concepts of the Group Process." *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy* 5 (July 1955): 236–46.

29. Martin, Elmore A., and Hill, William. "Toward a Theory of Group Development: Six Phases of Therapy Group Development." *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy* 7 (January 1957): 20–30.

30. Northen, Helen. "Social Group Work: A Tool for Changing Behavior of Disturbed Acting-out Adolescents." In *Social Work with Groups, 1958,* pp. 61–74. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1958.

31. Papell, Catherine B., and Rothman, Beulah. "Social Group Work Models: Possession and Heritage." *Journal of Education for Social Work* 2 (Fall 1966): 66–78.

32. Paradise, Robert. "The Factor of Timing in the Addition of New Members to Established Groups." *Child Welfare* 47 (November 1968): 524–29.

33. Parsons, Talcott. *The Social System.* Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951.

34. Polsky, Howard W. *Cottage Six.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1962.

35. ———. *The Dynamics of Residential Treatment: A Social Systems Approach.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968.

36. Psathas, George. "Phase Movement and Equilibrium Tendencies in Interaction Process in Psychotherapy Groups." *Sociometry* 23 (1960): 177–94.

37. Redl, Fritz. "Group Emotion and Leadership." In *Small Groups,* edited by A. Paul Hare, Edgar F. Borgatta, and Robert F. Bales, pp. 71–87. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1961.

38. Sarri, Rosemary, and Galinsky, Maeda. "A Conceptual Framework for Group Development." In *Readings in Group Work Practice,* edited by Robert D. Vinter, pp. 75–95. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Campus Publishers, 1967.

39. Scheidlinger, Saul. "The Concept of Social Group Work and Group Psychotherapy." *Social Casework* 34 (July 1953): 292–97.

40. Schwartz, William. "The Classroom Teaching of Social Work with Groups." In *A Conceptual Framework for the Teaching of the Social Group Work Method in the Classroom.* New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1964.

41. ———. "The Social Worker in the Group." In *New Perspectives on Services to Groups: Theory, Organization, and Practice.* New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1961.

42. ———. "Toward a Strategy of Group Work Practice." *Social Service Review* 38 (September 1962): 268–80.

43. Shalinsky, William. "Group Composition as an Element of Social Group Work Practice." *Social Service Review* 43 (March 1969): 42–50.

44. Shulman, Lawrence. *A Casebook of Social Work with Groups: The Mediating Model.* New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1968.

45. Silverman, Marvin. "Knowledge in Social Group Work: A Review of the Literature." *Social Work* 11 (July 1966): 56–62.

46. Slavson, Simon. *The Practice of Group*

Therapy. New York: International Universities Press, 1947.

47. Theodorson, George A. "Elements in the Progressive Development of Small Groups." *Social Forces* 31 (1953): 311–20.

48. Thomas, Edwin J., and Fink, Clinton F. "Effects of Group Size." *Psychological Bulletin* 60 (1963): 371–84.

49. Trecker, Harleigh B. *Social Group Work: Principles and Practices.* New York: Association Press, 1955.

50. Trieschman, Albert E.; Whittaker, James K.; and Brendtro, Larry K. *The Other 23 Hours: Child Care Work in a Therapeutic Milieu.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.

51. Tropp, Emanuel. "Group Intent and Group Structure: Essential Criteria for Group Work Practice." *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* 41 (Spring 1965): 229–50.

52. Vinter, Robert D. "The Essential Components of Social Group Work Practice." In *Readings in Group Work Practice,* edited by Robert D. Vinter, pp. 8–38. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Campus Publishers, 1967.

53. ———. "Group Work: Perspectives and Prospects." In *Social Work with Groups, 1959,* pp. 128–49. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1959.

54. ———. "Problems and Processes in Developing Group Work Practice Principles." In *Theory Building in Social Group Work.* New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1960.

55. Vinter, Robert D., and Galinsky, Maeda. "Extra-Group Relations and Approaches." In *Readings in Group Work Practice,* edited by Robert D. Vinter, pp. 110–23. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Campus Publishers, 1967.

56. Wiener, Hyman J. "Social Change and Social Group Work Practice." *Social Work* 9 (July 1964): 106–13.

57. ———. "Toward Techniques for Social Change." *Social Work* 6 (April 1961): 26–35.