

7

A HISTORY OF DIVISION 49 (GROUP PSYCHOLOGY AND GROUP PSYCHOTHERAPY)

MICHAEL P. ANDRONICO

The Division of Group Psychology and Group Psychotherapy originated at the February 8, 1991, meeting of the Council of Representatives of the American Psychological Association (APA). As the news of this new division traveled, many questions arose. Isn't there a division of group psychotherapy already in the APA? Why hasn't there been a division of group psychotherapy in the APA long before this? The primary answer to these questions is that group psychotherapy in this country had its organizational roots in the 1940s in two separate interdisciplinary organizations: the American Group Psychotherapy Association (AGPA) and the American Society for Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama (ASGPP). These organizations were started in 1942 in New York City by Samuel Slavson and Jacob Levy Moreno, respectively. The strong competitive personalities of these individuals got in the way of coming together to form one organization, so they formed separate groups. Moreno's organization stressed the psychodrama

Many people were involved in creating Division 49, but all of us involved in the division owe a debt to Arthur Teicher for his persistent efforts to begin the process and see it through to completion. With regard to the preparation of this chapter, thanks go to Richard Moreland, Division 49's archivist, for his editorial suggestions, and to Gladys Bishop for her valuable help in the preparation of this manuscript.

side of group psychotherapy. Many psychologists who were interested in group psychotherapy in those early years, and in the years following World War II, were associated with one or both of these organizations, with AGPA as the foremost group psychotherapy organization.

Arthur Teicher (1993) recalled that he and Samuel Kutash were active in the AGPA in the mid-1970s. (Both were fellows of that organization.) They lamented that there was not an obvious place for group psychotherapy in the structure of the APA and decided to “make a determined effort to make a place for group psychotherapy on the APA map” (p. 16). In order to implement their goal of a group psychotherapy division, Teicher and Kutash decided to publicize group psychotherapy within the APA. They did this by organizing formal programs in group psychotherapy at the annual APA conventions. They also made presentations on the subject of group psychotherapy at the mid-winter meetings of a variety of clinical divisions. Their offerings focused on both clinical and theoretical aspects of group psychotherapy.

These early panels were replete with psychologists who were recognized leaders in the field. Such luminaries as Jean Munzer, Fern Azima, Saul Tuttmann, Zanvel Liff, Marvin Aronson, Arthur Teicher, and Samuel Kutash were among those who presented on group psychotherapy to large and enthusiastic audiences.

The formation of sections within APA divisions on the subject of group psychotherapy was the first formal step toward attaining divisional status (Teicher, 1993, p. 16). The first of these, Division 29 (Psychotherapy), was receptive to the idea of a special interest section on group psychotherapy. Samuel Kutash died in 1979, and it was left to Teicher to carry on: “I invited a group of energetic, dedicated practicing group psychotherapists to join me: Jules Barron, Morris Goodman, Bert Schwartz, Irwin (Larry) Kutash, Michael Andronico, David Hescheles, and Gail Winbury” (Teicher, 1993). The “committee” soon became Section I (Group Psychotherapy) of Division 29. This section was to become the springboard for Division 49.

Following the initial lead of Drs. Teicher and Kutash, members of Section I began to give workshops and presentations at both the annual APA conventions and mid-winter divisional meetings. A full day of programming in Division 29’s hospitality suite program was also given at the annual convention. The large attendance at these meetings and workshops (some workshops had more than 100 participants), plus the enthusiastic responses and participation of everyone involved pointed to a need for a division of group psychotherapy. Some of the workshop leaders noted that the participants were often experienced clinicians who had good clinical skills but also seemed unschooled in group psychotherapy and the dynamics of group process. These observations further encouraged the leaders to spread the word about this important, insufficiently understood modality called “group.”

Near the end of the 1980s, the group movement continued into other divisions of the APA. The philosophy was to build a solid foundation in many divisions, so that the contemplated group division could gain a wider acceptance. Division 17 (Counseling Psychology) formed a section on group counseling in 1987. Division 12 (Clinical Psychology) formed Section VII (Group Psychotherapy) in 1989. Many of the core members of Section I (Group Psychotherapy) of Division 29 were involved in the development of these other sections. For example, Arthur Teicher was the initial president of Section VII of Division 12, and Morris Goodman was the second president, with Michael Andronico as treasurer and Candice Nattland as secretary.

John Borriello reported the results of the survey on group psychotherapy training in clinical, counseling, school and combined professional–scientific psychology that was initiated in 1988. The results indicated that both the academic and internship programs of counseling psychology offered the most training followed by school, clinical, and the combined professional–scientific. Many of the clinical programs responded that group psychotherapy training was not offered because faculty had no interest, lacked expertise, or felt that the group setting presented too many variables to take into account. This survey pointed out the need for more training in group psychotherapy in both the academic psychology programs and the psychology internship programs.

During this time the president of Section I was given a column in the Division 29 newsletter. In addition, Larry Kutash initiated and became the first editor of a newsletter titled *The Group Psychotherapist: Newsletter and Journal of Section I, Division 29 and Section 7, Division 12 of the American Psychological Association*. Larry Kutash put out three issues of this publication, the last of which announced the formation of Division 49. This newsletter, though brief in duration, set the stage for the Division 49 newsletter and journal. It contained the president's columns, business items, and a few brief articles of interest to group psychotherapists.

THE INTER DIVISIONAL COUNCIL ON GROUP PSYCHOTHERAPY

As a way of coordinating the many new sections of group psychotherapy in the several divisions mentioned, these groups formed the Inter Divisional Council on Group Psychotherapy in 1989. This council was a nonaffiliated organization with the goal of stimulating new membership and interest in group psychotherapy and in the APA in general by encouraging division program presentations at the annual APA conventions. A further goal was to keep psychologists who were committed to the study, practice, and re-

search of group psychotherapy informed about the progress of the planning for the main goal: a separate division for group psychotherapy within the APA. The officers of the Inter Divisional Council were Arthur Teicher, president; Michael Andronico, treasurer; David Heschel, coordinating secretary; and Gail Winbury, corresponding secretary.

At the end of the 1980s, there was a choice to be made: To continue to widen the base of support for the next few years and then apply for divisional status or to apply immediately for divisional status. An impetus for the latter was that the APA Council of Representatives had just lifted a previously imposed temporary ban on allowing new divisions into the APA. This action suggested that it was an ideal time to apply to become a division. Some concern was expressed that lifting the ban might result in a rash of new divisions, which might then stimulate the APA to reimpose the ban. Another factor in the consideration was the ruling that newly approved divisions would be given a 2-year provisional status before earning permanent divisional status. The purpose of this ruling was to ensure that all new divisions were viable. Viability meant maintaining a minimum number of members and an organizational structure for meeting the goals of the division. Lengthy debates began about whether to immediately push for a new division or to wait another year or two while expanding and consolidating the foundation of the sections of group psychotherapy in the other divisions. The ultimate decision was that the organization decided to immediately begin the process of becoming a division.

The core group of members of Section I of Division 29 began the movement toward establishing a division for group studies. One of the first issues was to name the proposed division. Most agreed on the name Division of Group Psychotherapy, with some possible variations. Some argued that an emphasis on psychology and the broader area of group studies was lacking. Gordon Boals proposed the title of group psychology and group psychotherapy, which provided for the psychological study of groups and still allowed for a clinical emphasis on the research and study of group psychotherapy. The group psychology aspect of the title opened the door for the expansion of the division's scope into all group areas, such as the study of industrial groups, self-led groups, Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) groups, families, political and religious groups, sports teams, and so on. These areas would have been less appropriate for a division that limited itself to the field of group psychotherapy.

The main goal of the division's initial planners was to establish one division of the APA in which psychologists concerned with groups of any kind could find a central home for their endeavors. This was a crucial step for the planners of the proposed division. Almost all of the planners were group psychotherapists. The planners passionately believed in the efficacy of group psychotherapy as a treatment modality. Having experienced the

impact of a group situation as participants and leaders in various settings, all were quite aware of the power and potency of a group setting. The expansion of the scope of the proposed division from group psychotherapy to all groups in all settings was a reflection of this deep felt belief in the value of groups both for psychology and for society. The following is taken from the mission statement of the planners to explain the reason for the division:

Petition for an APA Division of Group Psychology and
Group Psychotherapy

Our reason for the request for a division in the APA derives from the scientific and professional status that the group psychology and group psychotherapy has achieved. The belief was that having an APA division would increase communication between group psychologists and colleagues in other fields of psychology.

The extensive historical roots of group psychology and group psychotherapy combine many different fundamental foundations, approaches and methodologies. The need to share and exchange conceptualizations that may then be systematically studied is essential to the appropriate and relevant scientific growth of a credible body of knowledge. There is no organization of group psychology and group psychotherapy represented by APA that reflects the values, standards, and traditions of the discipline of psychology. The division aims to create such an organization. Other major objectives of the division are to establish criteria for education, training for competency and proficiency in group psychotherapy and in group dynamics and to establish more group training in internship and residency programs.

A highly extensive body of knowledge has been developed and accumulated in group psychology and group psychotherapy. The study of groups embodies educational, social, cultural and political issues. It also has profound applications to a variety of human concerns such as marriage, family life, and world peace.

There are two basic psychological approaches to human life and to mental health; one through individual psychology, the other through group psychology.

The scope, complexity and importance of mental and physical health requires careful research, study and analysis from both perspectives. We believe that the health of a democratic society is dependent on the effectiveness of its component groups and that the scientific method can be employed in the task of improving group life. Accordingly, we urge APA to establish a Division of Group Psychology and Group Psychotherapy.

The importance of creating a home for everyone interested in groups should be highlighted. Within psychology, one can find social psychologists, developmental psychologists, organizational psychologists, clinical psycholo-

gists, military psychologists, and so on, all studying groups. But within each field, the number of group folks is small and they do not feel empowered as a result. Imagine the impact of somehow getting them all together to talk about their work (people rarely read outside their field). A real movement could be created—the same would happen if people who study groups in different disciplines (psychology, sociology, business, education, social work, anthropology, political science) somehow got together. That was part of the dream for Division 49.

OBTAINING PETITIONS

One of the first and most important tasks of the movement toward divisional status was to obtain the required number of signatures from APA members who wanted a division of group psychology and group psychotherapy to become a part of the APA. This was a huge undertaking: The minimal number of signatures required was approximately 640. It was decided that a substantially higher number, such as 900 or 1000, would be more impressive and give the group a much better chance to achieve divisional status.

All of the people in the governance of Section I of Division 29 were involved in the gathering of signatures. I was responsible for putting the names on a central computer. This provided a more accurate ongoing summary of signatures, because many people were solicited by more than one person and had signed more than one petition. (They apparently followed the old adage, "Vote early and often.") In addition it helped to see which of our colleagues had not signed. At one point Morris Goodman came up with a list from the *National Register of Psychologists* of people who had listed group psychotherapy as a professional interest. A letter to this large group produced many signatures.

Solicitations at conventions of the American Group Psychotherapy Association, the APA, mid-winter meetings, and local meetings produced many of the needed signatures. Individual solicitations also resulted in a large number of signatures. David Hescheles and I brought in more than 300 signatures between us, and others such as Arthur Teicher, Morris Goodman, Joseph Kobos, John Borriello, George Gazda, Rex Stockton, Bert Schwartz, Barry Mitchell, Larry Kutash, and Gordon Boals contributed significantly as well. In 1990, signatures far exceeded the required number and fell just short of the optimum goal of 1000.

Once the signatures were gathered, the next step was to formally apply for divisional status. With the help of Sarah Jordan, who was in charge of divisional affairs at the APA, we filled out the requisite forms and our application was placed on the February 8, 1991, agenda for the APA Council of Representatives meeting in Washington, DC. At the last meeting of

Section I of Division 29 Stanley Moldawsky met informally with the division. He advised us about the procedures of the Council of Representatives and suggested ways to present our application that would maximize our chances for success. His advice and cooperation proved to be quite helpful.

Following one of Moldawsky's suggestions, many of us made telephone calls to key leaders of different divisions and interest groups in the APA. This was designed to solicit their support and determine which issues would have to be addressed. As a result of these calls, we appeared to have the support of most people, with only minor opposition. The primary opposition, though not aimed specifically at our application, was a minor reluctance on the part of some academically oriented members to the inclusion of another clinical division in the APA. Another issue was the gender imbalance of the proposed divisional leadership. The latter issue was corrected with the addition of several more women on the proposed board of directors.

ATTAINING PROVISIONAL DIVISION STATUS

When all of the work was completed, a small group headed to Washington to present the application for division status before the APA Council of Representatives. Arthur Teicher, Morris Goodman, and Michael Andronico met separately, with Joseph Kobos, who was already at the Council of Representatives meeting. The plan was to present the petition to the four politically influential special interest groups (called *caucuses*) on the night before the vote was to be taken by the Council of Representatives. The details were finalized and we all went to the caucus meetings. Questions were answered and reassurances were given on several issues. The need for a separate division on group psychology and group therapy was explained. It was pointed out that the new division would not "steal" members from other divisions, nor would it add enough new members to the pool of clinical membership to significantly skew the APA's membership away from the academic influence. The presentations went well and we agreed that all four of the caucuses were receptive to the proposed division.

The next day, the Council of Representatives had the application on its agenda. There was some discussion on the floor, with almost all of the speakers favoring the proposal. The only negative note was the academic group, which voiced a concern about the previously mentioned imbalance between academic and clinical influences in the APA. The final vote was taken by a show of hands, and an overwhelming majority favored the division, which for the first time was named Division 49. Even though the outcome was expected, those present were ecstatic at the realization that many years of effort had finally culminated in the goal of having a division of group psychology and group psychotherapy in the APA. As the pioneer,

leader, and founding president of Division 49, Arthur Teicher gave an acceptance speech, thanking the Council of Representatives for its approval.

BUILDING THE INFRASTRUCTURE

The major step was now taken. The next step was to establish an organizational structure to fulfill the requirements for a permanent division of the APA. The names of the officers and board of directors had already been selected and circulated. The board members were John Borriello, George Gazda, Gloria Gottsegen, Ruth Hochbery, Susanne Jensen, Harriett Kaley, Jose Redondo, Bert Schwartz, and Morris Goodman. The first president, as mentioned, was Arthur Teicher, with Joseph Kobos as president elect, David Hescheles as secretary, and Michael Andronico as treasurer.

Because most of the officers and board members were planning to attend the AGPA meetings the following month, it was decided that the first formal meeting of Division 49 would be held then. After the initial congratulations and celebration, the division began the many tasks of organizing itself. Gloria Gottsegen and David Hescheles did an admirable job in compiling the Division 49 bylaws. Committees were formed and chairs were assigned to head these committees, with the goals of providing mission statements and recruiting members for each committee.

One of the most crucial committees was the publications committee. George Gazda was its initial chair. He studied the need for a journal in the field of group psychology and group psychotherapy and found that there was indeed such a need. His data and analysis became the basis for the justification of the division's journal. (Stewart, Stewart, & Gazda, 1997). The publication committee also started the first Division 49 newsletter. Initial copies of the newsletter were titled *The Bulletin of the Division of Group Psychology and Group Psychotherapy*. Louis Schlesinger was its original editor and remained in that position for 3 years. Schlesinger was followed by David Kipper, whose first issue was titled *Perspectives*. The next and subsequent issues were given the more permanent title *The Group Psychologist*. Kipper turned the newsletter into a professional publication and increased its issues from two to three issues annually.

DECIDING ABOUT THE SECTIONS IN OTHER DIVISIONS

Now that there was a central "home" division for group psychology and group psychotherapy, the matter of dealing with sections of group psychotherapy in other divisions had to be decided. There was some initial

sentiment for maintaining the Inter Divisional Council, but it was finally decided to disband that group and encourage the sections to focus their energies on Division 49. Once Division 49 achieved provisional status at the APA, Section I of Division 29 held a meeting at which the decision was made that Section I was now redundant in purpose and goals with Division 49; it therefore was disbanded by popular vote. Because the dues for Section I were collected independently of Division 29, it was decided that the treasury of Section I be contributed to Division 49 to help with start-up expenses.

Most of the other group sections in other divisions also disbanded and devoted their energies to Division 49. The group section in Division 39 (Psychoanalysis), however, had just come into existence before Division 49 was established. This section voted to retain its place in Division 39. Nearly all of its members later joined Division 49 as well.

THE FIRST CONVENTION AS A DIVISION

With a budget and a newsletter for the division, organizational plans were soon put into place. Some convention programming time was given to the division and this allowed the division to supplement the programs on group psychology and group psychotherapy that were already accepted through other divisions. The keynote address for Division 49 was given by Scott Rutan, a well-known author of several books on group psychotherapy and a former president of AGPA. His topic was "Group Therapy in Today's Society."

The 1991 APA convention in San Francisco was regarded as a distinct success by Division 49. The group programs were well attended and enthusiastically received. New members were recruited and the social hour following the membership meeting was attended by an array of members. Joseph Kobos coordinated Division 49's programming and activities for this convention. In addition to his duties as president elect, he also dealt with the pressures of putting together a last-minute convention program.

THE DIPLOMATE IN GROUP PSYCHOLOGY

One of the early tasks that the division board of directors decided to take on was to apply to the American Board of Examiners for Professional Psychologists (ABEPP) for a Diplomate in group psychology, the highest credential for a psychologist in an applied specialty. A committee, led by Morris Goodman and Joseph Kobos, was formed to achieve this goal; Bert Schwartz compiled a database to answer the voluminous application form.

Following the precedent of other Diplomate-seeking divisions, a separate entity to pursue Diplomatic status was established, independent of Division 49.

After a great deal of work by the committee, the American Board of Examiners for Professional Psychology voted to approve the application for Diplomate status for group psychology in 1995. The content and form of the exam for the Diplomate in group psychology was completed in 1997. Throughout this long, tedious process, Goodman and Kobos kept the board and the membership informed of the progress, both at board meetings and in the newsletter.

THE FIRST FULL YEAR: 1992

1992 represented the division's first full year. It was also the first year of elections. The results of these elections placed Morris Goodman as president elect for 1993 and Bruce Bernstein and Leon Hoffman as the new board members for 1993. (As an economy gesture, the board of directors number had been reduced from its initial nine members to six members.) The election also resulted in Allan Elfant being selected as the second secretary. A complete list of officers and board members can be found in Tables 20 and 21.

For the second consecutive year, there was a board of directors meeting held at the site of the annual conference of the American Group Psychotherapy Association. This followed the financial rationale that guided many later mid-winter board meetings. Because most of the officers and board members attended the AGPA meetings anyway, Division 49 would only incur travel and other expenses for a few board members. To help facilitate these meetings and provide a liaison between AGPA and Division 49, AGPA also provided Division 49 with a complimentary meeting room. In addition to these generous acts, AGPA hosted dinners with the officers of AGPA and Division 49 to discuss forming a liaison between those organizations. (Division 49 is indeed obliged to AGPA and its CEO, Marsha Block, for their cooperation and generosity.)

Another organization outside the APA, the Association for Specialists in Group Work (ASGW), also has contributed to the Division 49 membership and leadership pool. Many of the Division 17 (Counseling Psychology) special interest section members were also members of ASGW, which is the group work division of the American Counseling Association. George Gazda, who was influential in helping to get Division 49 started, was also the first president of ASGW, which began in 1973. Rex Stockton, who was chair of the Division 17 section on group work and a former president of ASGW, also assisted in the formation of Division 49. A number of other

TABLE 20
Officers of Division 49

Year	President	President-elect	Past president	Secretary	Treasurer
1991	Arthur Teicher	Joseph Kobos	None	David Hescheles	Michael Andronico
1992	Arthur Teicher	Joseph Kobos	None	David Hescheles	Michael Andronico
1993	Joseph Kobos	Morris Goodman	Arthur Teicher	Allan Eifant	Michael Andronico
1994	Morris Goodman	Michael Andronico	Joseph Kobos	Allan Eifant	David Hescheles
1995	Michael Andronico	John Borriello	Morris Goodman	Allan Eifant	David Hescheles
1996	John Borriello	Allan Eifant	Michael Andronico	Rae Perls	David Hescheles
1997	Allan Eifant	David Kipper	John Borriello	Rae Perls	Rex Stockton
1998	David Kipper	Richard Moreland	Allan Eifant	Judith Schoenholz-Read	Rex Stockton

TABLE 21
Board of Directors of Division 49

Year	Members
1991	John Borriello, George Gazda, Morris Goodman, Gloria Gottsegen, Ruth Hochbery, Susanne Jensen, Harriet Kaley, Jose Redondo, Bert Schwartz
1992	John Borriello, George Gazda, Morris Goodman, Gloria Gottsegen, Ruth Hochberg, Susanne Jensen, Harriet Kaley, Jose Redondo, Bert Schwartz
1993	Bruce Bernstein, John Borriello, George Gazda, Morris Goodman, Gloria Gottsegen, Ruth Hochberg, Leon Hoffman, Jose Redondo
1994	Bruce Bernstein, June Blum, John Borriello, Gloria Gottsegen, Leon Hoffman, Marian Yeager
1995	June Blum, Daryl Feldman, Gloria Gottsegen, Richard Moreland, Arthur Teicher, Marian Yeager
1996	June Blum, Daryl Feldman, Gloria Gottsegen, Richard Moreland, Arthur Teicher, Marian Yeager
1997	Daryl Feldman, Addie Fuhriman, Gloria Gottsegen, Richard Moreland, Judith Schoenholtz-Read, Arthur Teicher
1998	Michael P. Andronico, Addie Fuhriman, Arthur Horne, Ruby Jones, Eric Sundstrom, Arthur Teicher

members and leaders from Division 17 and ASGW are playing key roles in Division 49, including John Corazzini, Robert Conyne, Arthur Horne, and Dennis Kivlighan.

During this 1992 AGPA convention there were several programs co-sponsored by AGPA and Division 49. One of these was a forum that dealt with liaison issues between AGPA and Division 49, led by Scott Rutan, a former president of AGPA, and Arthur Teicher, the president of Division 49. In addition, Division 49 sponsored complimentary breakfast meetings during the years of 1994, 1995, and 1996 at the annual meeting of AGPA, aimed at publicizing Division 49 to psychologists attending AGPA meetings.

This cooperative effort between AGPA and Division 49 reflects the mission of Division 49, which is to stimulate, teach, and disseminate ideas on groups, and to provide liaison with other organizations with similar goals. It is also indicative of the appreciation that the bulk of the founders hold for AGPA. The first five presidents of Division 49, as well as most of the members of its board of directors, were fellows of the AGPA. This is indicative of the pioneering work that AGPA has made in the interdisciplinary field of group psychotherapy.

The process of establishing a formal structure for Division 49 continued with efforts to recruit people beyond the early core group of organizers. Geographical diversification also was important, with an emphasis on getting members from all parts of the country. The membership committee was now chaired by Kenneth Roberson from San Fransisco following Candice

Nattland and later cochaired by Silvio Silvestri, also from the San Francisco area. A formal program committee was formed with Darryl Feldman and John Rochios as cochairs. Feldman was from New York and coordinated meetings on the East Coast, and Rochios was from San Francisco and coordinated meetings on the West Coast. Rex Stockton, from Indiana, became the first chair of the research committee, and Richard Weigel from Utah was the first chair of the fellowship committee.

The Centennial Convention

The APA annual convention in 1992 was held in Washington, DC, and it was the first year of full programming for the division. Feldman and Rochios planned the events. As part of Division 49's programming, it was decided that each year an award would be given to the outstanding group psychologist. The recipient would make a speech concerning his or her area of expertise following acceptance. The outstanding group psychologist for 1992 was Henriette Glatzer. Her talk was titled, "50 Years of Analytic Group Psychotherapy."

The membership meeting that preceded the talk established a precedent of offering several presentations. Each year the newly appointed fellows of Division 49 would be announced and those fellows in attendance would be introduced. The recipient of the research award for the best dissertation on groups was presented with the \$200 prize, as well as a plaque. The past president is awarded a plaque as well.

It was in 1992 that Division 49 applied for and was approved as an APA sponsor of continuing education. The application process was conducted by John Borriello. This enabled Division 49 to sponsor postdoctoral institutes, which are usually held just before the APA convention.

Council Representation

In all of the elections for Council representatives, Division 49 narrowly missed the necessary votes for a full, separate Council representative. As a result, coalitions were formed with other divisions. During 1992, Division 49 formed a coalition with the Division of Media Psychology (Division 46), which continued in 1993 and 1994. Gloria Gottsegen, a board member of Division 49, served as the Council representative for this coalition through 1997. In 1995, Division 49 formed a coalition for Council representative with Division 30 (Psychological Hypnosis). In 1996 and 1997 another coalition was formed, with Division 51 (The Society for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity).

THE YEAR OF PERMANENT DIVISION STATUS: 1993

To this point I have presented the details and manner in which Division 49 was developed and begun. The following provides a more personal touch from Joseph Kobos, who was the president of Division 49 in 1993.

I had been involved in group psychotherapy and other group work since graduate school. Groups were and continue to be for me a therapeutic format that make theories and ideas come alive. One could see the behavior, feel the energy and sense that conflicts between and within people were resolved in the midst of a group. My dissertation was on "group" and I always gravitated to professional work and association that involved group.

To me it is not surprising that Arthur Teicher and his group found me and elicited my involvement. My experiences had demonstrated that group processes and forces were unique and must be examined and understood in their own right. While an understanding of individual behavior is essential, the functioning of individuals within a group cannot be understood without paying attention to the unique forces that operate in a group. . . . The tasks of my presidency were to get our division visible in the eyes of the APA. One goal was to pursue the development of a journal. We were very fortunate that George Gazda, an eminent teacher and writer on group work, agreed to chair our Publications Committee. Another goal began in my term. A work group was established to pursue the Diplomate in Group Psychology and Group Psychotherapy through the American Board of Professional Psychology. Three of us, Morris Goodman, Louis Schlesinger as secretary and I as vice-chair took on the project. Bert Schwartz took responsibility for organizing the written proposal that we submitted to ABPP. After some revisions, we were finally accepted. While writing this review I was very touched in remembering various people who have been involved with different projects. I was most fortunate to meet and work with hard working, independent and committed individuals who were willing to take risks and establish structures that would help the field of group psychology and psychotherapy flourish. (Kobos, personal communication, 1993)

At the APA annual convention in Toronto, the division scheduled an assortment of events ranging from applied, experiential workshops on group psychotherapy through panel presentations to the application of research approaches to the group setting. The recipient of the 1993 Outstanding Group Psychologist of the Year was Robert Dies. His invited address was titled, "The Implications of Group Psychotherapy Research for Clinical Practice."

During 1993, Division 49 initiated the use of a hospitality suite at the APA convention in Toronto, which enabled the division to have 2 full days for committee meetings, additional program hours held in an informal setting, and a more informal and pleasant social hour.

An intensive membership drive was launched by Division 49 at this time. This drive was led by Richard Mikesell, who served as a consultant. In appreciation for his help in this matter, and his advice about other issues as well, he received an award of recognition at the membership meeting at the 1994 APA convention.

THE YEAR OF MOVING FORWARD: 1994

Morris Goodman was president in 1994, and most of the projects that were initiated on a long-term basis continued, the main focus being on developing the committees. For example, George Gazda, the chair of the publications committee, continued the process of contacting potential publishers for the proposed division journal. Goodman came up with a working principle for the journal that was approved by all. His idea was that each clinical article would be commented on by a researcher, with possible suggestions about how to study the clinical concepts contained in that article. The same would hold true for research articles, with possible clinical applications suggested for those articles. In this way, research and practice would become more closely aligned. The concept of mutual commentary across basic and applied publications was put into practice for the lead articles in each of the four issues of the journal published in 1997. (See Table 22 for a list of the recipients of the Outstanding Psychologist of the Year award.)

TABLE 22
Outstanding Psychologist of the Year

Year	Recipient	Topic
1991	Scott Rutan	Group therapy in today's society
1992	Henriette Glatzer	50 years of analytic group psychotherapy
1993	Robert Dies	Implications of group psychotherapy, research for clinical practice
1994	Saul Scheidlinger	Nine decades of group psychotherapy
1995	Herbert Kelman	Group processes in the resolution of international conflicts: Experiences from the Israeli-Palestinian case
1996	Don Forsyth	Function of group
1997	Yvonne Agazarian	System-centered therapy for groups; Demonstration and discussion
1998	Louis Ormont	Group as an Agent of Change

THE CULMINATION OF MANY PROJECTS: 1995

Michael Andronico was president in 1995, and it was during this year that many of the long-term projects of Division 49 came to fruition. The first Division 49 *Membership Directory* was published and disseminated. David Kipper, the editor of the division's newsletter, *The Group Psychologist*, also produced the directory.

Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, the long-planned journal, also came into existence in this year. At the division's membership meeting, Susan Knapp, senior director of publications at the APA, accepted my signature on the contract, which meant that the APA would publish the journal.

Following Morris Goodman's working principle mentioned previously, I suggested the structure of the journal should include an overall editor who coordinates with two associate editors. One associate editor evaluates the research submissions and the other evaluates the clinical and other applications. The editorial board reflects the wide scope of the journal. It is a tripartite board, with members covering the areas of clinical groups, organizational groups, and social psychology. Editor (Donelson Forsyth) and associate editors (Gary Burlingame and Kipling Williams) were selected for the journal.

EXPANDING THE SCOPE: 1996

John Borriello was president in 1996, and he focused on the need for division members to empirically investigate their commonly held group psychology and group psychotherapy beliefs and practices (Borriello, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c). He noted that the status quo in psychological theory and practice was changing. In order to survive, he urged division members to carefully reexamine their practices in light of the new knowledge available. Borriello especially urged clinicians to revisit and pay attention to the science component of their training, and he made a concerted effort to get the social psychologists to become division members.

For the 1996 APA convention, the call for papers focused on small, large, and intergroup dynamics; team building; and group therapy. Borriello reviewed proposals for the APA convention program in 1996 and 1997, because he was chair for both years. Most proposals were descriptive and anecdotal, with few empirical investigations. The descriptors for these groups were not only psychotherapy or therapy, but to his delight, self-help, support, therapeutic, team building, psychosocial, behavioral-cognitive, change

agent, systems-centered, and prevention. For Borriello, this indicated that the group psychology component had finally joined in the division's activities.

MISSION AND GOALS FOR DIVISION 49

A great deal of time and effort has been expended in the development of an organizational structure for Division 49. It is crucial to keep the goals, mission, and purpose for establishing an organization in mind throughout its development and maintenance. When goals or purposes change, the structure of the organization also needs to change, so that the structure does not determine the goals of the organization but rather that function follows form and the organization reflects the goals.

As mentioned previously, Division 49 was planned more than two decades ago by Arthur Teicher and Samuel Kutash. This was to have a place for group psychotherapy in the APA. As these plans evolved and others joined in, the members wanted a division in which psychologists could discuss and teach one another their theories, research, and practice. As the movement developed, the scope of study was expanded to include group psychology. Group dynamics and group issues could be as traditional as group psychotherapy and as novel as the application of group dynamics to political and national leadership policies and their effects.

The makeup of the board of directors also reflects this increasing diversification of group studies. Many of the new members come from research backgrounds, or specialize in organizational and other groups that are not specifically psychotherapy.

THE FUTURE OF GROUPS AND DIVISION 49

With the celebration of the APA's golden anniversary of divisions and the upcoming twenty-first century and third millennium in sight, speculating about the future of Division 49 is an appropriate ending to this chapter. Any predictions need to take into account the future of the study, research, and practice of groups. The following are excerpts from the leaders of the division pertaining to the future of groups.

In his presidential column in the *Group Psychologist*, Michael Andronico offered one direction for Division 49.

The main thrust for the division now is expanding our scope and make others aware of our mission with the theme of "Think Group!" In 1996, the APA will be celebrating the 50th anniversary of the divisions of the APA. What better time to inform others of the value of groups, in

all of their myriad forms! And who better to do this than Division 49! The leadership of Division 49 has been active in starting to spread the concepts of "Group and Group Awareness" within the APA. We now need to expand our vistas to include a "cultural diversity of groups," both in a variety of theoretical orientations and a variety of environments such as academic, clinical, industrial and political. (Andronico, 1995b)

The future holds promise for the application of clinical practice to groups. A comprehensive model of group practice would involve a combination of psychoeducational groups, time limited groups and on-going psychotherapy groups. (Andronico, 1995a)

A recognition of the value of groups is reflected in the self-help group movement (Finn, 1996; Goodman & Jacobs, 1994; Katz, 1981) Group practitioners and group researchers should study the dynamics of these groups, make suggestions about how to help improve them, and add to the knowledge base of groups. The changing group climate of industry and gender issues as well as looking at leadership styles in groups and nations are additional worthwhile areas of future study.

John Borriello's views on the future for the division include the following:

John Borriello supports empirical investigations of both group psychology and group psychotherapy. This would examine the input-throughput-output of what the division members do in their practices. John asserts that we need outcome data about what we do in order to increase support from the society at large.

He finds clinicians reluctant to consider that more empirical evidence demonstrating favorable outcome would increase society's support. He believes that the message of society to the division clinical members is that it will no longer support keeping patients for years on end in a hospital or practice setting without evidence of demonstrable positive change in quality of life.

John is puzzled why this lack of support has not motivated more division clinical members to investigate their theories and practices.

The division needs to draw boundaries around and define what group psychotherapy is. The next is to avoid the error of playing executive board musical chairs which has been made by many boards of organizations. New ideas and productive growth occur from new faces. To borrow from General Systems Theory, closed systems stagnate and eventually die. The third is that the division has to recruit more members who identify with the group psychology (group dynamics) component of the division. (Borriello, personal communication, 1997)

Rex Stockton also heavily endorses research as crucial to the division. He stated,

Division 49 has had an active research committee which has, in a variety of ways, worked to encourage research. This has been done through awarding prizes to promising young researchers, sponsoring presentations at the annual conference, as well as other conventional means. Since so much of group work's credibility rests on research findings concerning its efficacy, in the future it will become even more important to find ways to encourage research.

It is important to increase the cadre of scholars interested in examining the various facets of group work. This is an important task for Division 49 to carry out. We have seen that even in our applied field, knowledge of the overall efficacy of group therapy can have a major effect on the marketplace. Thus both practitioners and small group researchers have much to gain from the division's efforts to increase and enhance research in the field. (Stockton, personal communication, 1997)

Allan Elfant's perspective is as follows:

My visionary wish for Division 49 is to stay grounded and connected with our passionate attachment to group psychotherapy and its research foundation. It is imperative that our Division provide a vital place where love for clinical work in groups is matched by regard for research which acknowledges the dynamic energy intrinsic to groups. Applications to other group contexts should also be nurtured so the utilization of groups for human progress and creativity can be fully appreciated. We are at a risky crossroads as a division. Our differences can be divisive and fragmenting, or our conflicts can lead to cohesion and strength. We know that groups carry enormous potential for transformation. I believe that insisting on an open airing of our disagreements as well as what draws us together will give our Division the opportunity to inform APA and the public of the indisputable power and significance of group psychotherapy and other group interventions. (Elfant, personal communication, 1997)

Richard Moreland has been involved with the division in several capacities. His role as archivist was of enormous value to the author. The following are excerpts from his personal reactions and thoughts on the future:

It was brave for the division to include nontherapist folk in its ranks. And division members seem sincere about being inclusionary, rather than exclusionary. As a kind of "token academic" in the division, I have received a warm welcome and been allowed to take on a variety of important jobs. I'm grateful for that, and impressed that division members are so open. (Moreland, personal communication, 1997)

Richard Moreland's visions for the future include the following:

I think that to keep healthy, we will need to do one of two things. First, we could become an activist organization that works to produce

concrete benefits (through lobbying, public education efforts, etc.) for group psychotherapists. Unless we begin to provide such benefits, I worry that our therapy members will start to drop out. Or, we could become the home for groups folks of all kinds (therapists and nontherapists, researchers and practitioners, academics and real-worlders) and serve as a kind of clearinghouse for innovative work on groups. Either of these options, please note, would require a Division 49 much different from what we have now. (Moreland, personal communication, 1997)

Donald Forsyth's general commentary follows.

The future of groups is bright, in terms of theory, research, and practice. Researchers and practitioners across many disciplines are all shifting their sights to focus more on group-level processes rather than individual-level ones. As organizations become more multicultural, issues of group composition and diversity rise in importance. In therapeutic settings shifts in health care have created practical advantages for those who can use groups to achieve change. And the public, in general, is becoming increasingly interested in groups, for they are often viewed as both panaceas for and the causes of contemporary problems. The Division is in the fortunate position of being ready to meet the extra demands that this increased focus on groups will create. The Division's journal, in particular, stands ready to contribute to the growth of the field by publishing studies that integrate the basic and applied sides of the scientific study of groups.

Recent analysis of the effectiveness of group psychotherapy and other group-level applications are promising, far more research is needed to identify strengths, weakness of various group interventions and the processes that mediate their success. Whereas in the past people who wanted to examine groups had to fight for space in other journals—and often confronted an anti-group bias—the division's journal is group-friendly: it unabashedly favors data-based papers and theoretical analyses of groups. (Forsyth, personal communication, 1997)

CONCLUSION

In summary, Division 49 is the division that was founded by psychologists with a passionate belief in the efficacy and power of groups, both as a treatment modality and a unique set of dynamics produced when people come together. The pioneers of the division were group psychotherapy practitioners and researchers who wanted a central place for psychologists to meet and communicate their ideas. These psychologists had the vision to include all endeavors related to groups and not to limit this division to the practice and research of group psychotherapy. The title of the division,

Group Psychology and Group Psychotherapy, reflects the emphasis that all types of groups are sufficient subject matter for Division 49.

As the division has grown, the new membership is indicative of the wide variety of group settings and types of groups that these members study. These members are from academia, institutional and agency settings, industry, and independent practice. The organizational structure and governance has expanded the scope of the division, with the latest elected division president Richard Moreland being the first president who is not a group psychotherapist. The division's journal is indicative of the large content area of groups as well. Along with the new journal is the older newsletter, which keeps the members abreast of the developments within the division and some of the developments in the field of group psychology and group psychotherapy.

As the world moves toward a new century and a new millennium, many new human endeavors are coming about. Most of these endeavors have to do with people in many different groups of many different sizes and goals. Group scholars need to rely on group knowledge and skills to help bring about productive changes and sensitize others to the value and need for better functioning groups in the world.

REFERENCES

- Andronico, M. (1995a, April). *Whither goes group psychotherapy?: A look to the future*. Keynote address to the New Jersey Association for Psychodrama and Group Psychotherapy Annual Conference.
- Andronico, M. (1995b, October). From the president. *The Group Psychologist*, 5 (3), 1.
- Borriello, J. F. (1996a). From the president. *The Group Psychologist*, 6 (2), 1, 11.
- Borriello, J. F. (1996b). From the president. *The Group Psychologist*, 6 (3), 1, 8.
- Borriello, J. F. (1996c). From the president. *The Group Psychologist*, 6 (1), 1.
- Bulletin of the *Division of Group Psychology and Group Psychotherapy*. (Summer 1991). Petition for the APA Division of Group Psychology and Group Psychotherapy. Vol. 1 (1), 5-7.
- Finn, J. (1996). *Computer based self-help groups: On-line recovery for addictions*. *Computers in Human Services*, 13(1), 21-41.
- Forsyth, D. (1997, March). *The Group Psychologist*, 7 (1), 3.
- Goodman, G. & Jacobs, M. K. (1994). The self-help mutual support group. In A. Fuhriman and G. M. Burlingame (Eds.) *Handbook of group psychotherapy: An empirical and clinical synthesis* (pp. 489-526). New York: John Wiley.
- Katz, A. H. (1981). Self-help and mutual aid: An emerging social movement? *Annual Review of Sociology*, 7, 129-155.

- Kipper, D. (1998). From the president: *The Group Psychologist*, 8 (2).
- Stewart, A. E., Steward, E. A., & Gazda, G. A. (1997). Assessing the need for a new group journal. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 1, 75–85.
- Teicher, A. (1993, Summer). *Bulletin of the Division of Group Psychology and Group Psychotherapy*, 3, (2) 17.