

Journal #1

According to Zaslow (2019), groups by nature produce unique experience and are unable to be confined to a standard expectation as there are multiple types of groups, with different purposes and required skillsets. But most importantly, participants bring a plethora of independent variables that affect group dynamics and results. This is the case as well for the In-Person Group of Clinical Social Work Practice III.

Group Type and Stage

I would categorize our Practice Group as either being a Task group—one intentionally formed for the purpose of completing a specific “task”; and *maybe* a Social Conversation group, one that is “informal” but providing a means of developing relationship with members we are not too familiar with (Zaslow, p. 4). As this is not a clinical group, there would be no need for an Intake or Assessment process. There is also no need or no potential for Member selection since the groups are determined by location and of involuntary membership (Zaslow, p. 25).

The In-Person Group is made up of strong personalities, and this was apparent from the initial group on January 19th. For the first group task, initially, there was silence and a bit of “[testing] out” until there was a group leader who took charge (Zaslow, p. 18). The leader would be a Group Facilitator in this case (Zaslow, p. 38). In terms of the Stage of Development, Garland, Jones, and Kolodny Model would suggest that the group is in Preaffiliation stage (Zaslow, p. 18). The Tuckman Model would suggest the group being in Forming stage, “[working] on being accepted,” and the Northen and Kurland Model would place the group in the Inclusion-Orientation stage determining where there is a feeling of inclusion (Zaslow, p. 20-21).

1/19

The group leader for this day, taking on the role as Group Facilitator, delegated roles and responsibilities; there was direction and an agenda on completing the group assignment— hopefully with consideration of the strengths of group members. There wasn't much of a discussion of identifying the type of group (this was also the first group and there was no lesson).

Though not at that stage, there was a bit of Power and Control dynamics. There was someone that interjected with the perspective of wanting and identifying the principles of the group. My role was mediator, and though I reflected to the best of my ability and explained the direction of the group, there was no dialogue. The individual would repeatedly attempt to get their point across until the group leader reiterated the direction (albeit a bit directly) and the individual gave in. This group was a bit more on the Authoritative style, there was a leader and we followed their directions. This leader was also a charismatic leader (Zaslow, p. 75), having Personal Power Corey, p. 16), they were confident and made moves to achieve the goal and purpose.

1/26

The group experience was a bit frustrating, it felt like some members were contributing. There was a dominant voice but I felt like we weren't reading the directions and felt that in response to the case study, we weren't being client-centered. I did not speak up, partially because we were running out of time, and partially because it felt like we were just moving on and going along with this direction. Our group has a lot of fun and are friendly towards each

other, which is a positive; however, it feels like we miss the objective of the group activity and don't take it as seriously (this is strictly my observation).