

# THE UPSIDES OF HUMAN PROCESS TRAINING LABORATORIES OVER OTHER GROUP DEVELOPMENT MODELS

James C. Dabhi\*

**Abstract** Over the years, organisations have evolved in terms of shape, size, diversity, technology, and output. In the competitive world, organisation and publicity are often heightened with little substance. Mere pronouncements about developing and learning organisations often fail to account for their human resources and ongoing development. Such growth does not happen without continuous learning and training of organisation members. In the present context, many organisations overlook this aspect or ignore it. Most of the work in the organisations is done through groups or referred to as teams. While the article distinguishes between a group and a team, it uses these terms interchangeably. There are group development theories and models. The models of team development are frameworks to explain stages of change in a group as they begin, form, and move towards achieving their common goals. In management parlance, there are two major functions: the task and people functions. In pursuing profit maximising, cost-cutting, laying off staff, increasing work hours, and techniques to improve production and sales become important. Often, managers overlook the people function or view it merely as a tool to achieve their goals. This article will quickly examine four group-building models or frameworks, with a focus on the human process learning experience model and its advantages in comparison with the others. The first two group development frameworks, Tuckman's model and the GRPI model (Goals, Roles, Processes, and Interpersonal Relationships), are conceptual/theoretical frameworks that are more appropriate for workshop and classroom learning. While the other models, Group Therapy and Human Process Training Laboratory (HPTL), are based on lived experience in the group in the present moment, they differ. The paper explains the framework, discusses its context and utility, and proposes that the HPTL model, which is focused on person function and on experiential learning, has an advantage over others.

**Keywords:** Organisation, Behaviour, Group Development, T-Group Training, Human Processes, Psychotherapy

## INTRODUCTION

Organisations are part of society, playing the important role of meeting people's needs as well as generating employment and contributing to the national economy and owners' wealth. Organisations are influenced by the social milieu, and at the same time, they impact the social environment physically and culturally. Some organisations even pollute the social well-being (Dabhi, 2017) in their pursuit of profit maximisation. Profitability and efficiency are good goals, but they are not enough to develop the business. The goal of human development must inform all the ends for which the company is organised and run (Alford & Naughton, 2001).

Organisations are also spaces for the socialisation of people working in them and working for them. Thus, workplace

culture is influenced by people who dominate and control the market economy of the place, and this, in turn, influences people who work there, of course, to the employer's advantage. Thus, the workplace culture and human interaction are results of socialisation as much as they are instruments of socialisation of people who work within these places (Dabhi, 2005).

In the global context of organisational complexity and interactions with other organisations, the local and global economic and socio-political milieu, and pursuing its goal, it is critical to pay attention to the organisation's internal processes and the people who work there. Organisations achieve their objectives through diverse task forces composed of work groups. Group size and workload vary by organisation, as does the nature of their output. However,

\* Email: jimmydabhi@gmail.com

the nucleus of a group remains consistent across different groupings. Therefore, knowing groups, their growth trajectory, and performance in the organisation are vital. Organisations place a high value on the ability of their group and its members, but the functioning of organisations and their groups in today's sociopolitical, environmental, and technological environments necessitates a closer look at how these groups work and develop to face challenges as a group (Vaida & Eraban, 2021).

Many Indian organisations have well-positioned human resource management units. These units arrange a variety of in-service and external staff training as part of their plan to grow the organisation's personnel and increase productivity and effectiveness. Improving human interactions and successful group work are essential components of organisational management (Baker et al., 2006, Tohidi, 2011). Organisational learning takes numerous forms and ways. Human relationships at work are routinely ignored for the sake of efficiency and productivity. In the fierce struggle for profit maximisation through cost-cutting and staff layoffs, training and group growth frequently take a backseat.

Management schools teach organisational and group behaviour, but the lived behavioural component of employees in workgroups is typically disregarded. According to Bradshaw and Roberts (2003), the social environment, the worker's psychological requirements, and management approaches all have an impact on human behaviour at work. The theories created during the classical period are still relevant to modern management because they address concerns about social and psychological fulfilment, both of which are necessary for a happy work environment.

Regardless of size or location, groups are complicated and frequently meet issues that hinder them from working to their full capacity (Tartell, 2016). These workgroups embody the organisation's culture, values, and desirable behaviour. Group formation, development, and effectiveness are all vital aspects of continuing training and learning. There has been numerous research on groups, as well as theories and group development procedures (Hill & Gruner, 1973). Some group development frameworks that organisations may use to develop their groups include the Hackman Model of Team Effectiveness, Tuckman's model, the GRPI model (Goals, Roles, Processes, and Interpersonal Relationships), Group Psychotherapy and T-group Learning, and the experiential Human Process Training Laboratory (HPTL) model, among others.

## UNDERSTANDING A WORKING GROUP

Sociology has given rise to the concepts of group. In sociology, a group is defined as people who share similar

norms, attitudes, and expectations and interact regularly. Sociologists see distinctions between different types of groups, such as primary, secondary, in-groups, out-groups, and reference groups (Schaefer, 2010). The sociological perspective of groups helps us to understand teams in an organisation. Thus, a group is a tiny unit of an organisation that collaborates on a common goal; in this way, the group becomes a team in an organisational context. In the article, we shall use the group and team interchangeably. Sociologists investigate organisations primarily because of their influence over individuals. A substantial body of research demonstrates that group membership has a strong influence on people's everyday behaviour (Swann et al., 2012; Markman, 2015; Abraham, 2016). A definition sets a boundary and tells us what is and what may not be a group, as well as the nature of the group. Managers spend substantial time managing groups so that groups contribute to organisational and group goals. A team is more richly defined as a collection of individuals who have relations with one another that make them interdependent to some significant degree (Cartwright & Zander, 1968).

Regarding group dynamics, sociologists have long explored how people act in groups to bridge individual and societal forms of meaning-making and activity (Blumer, 1969). According to Robbins and Judge (2013:10), organisational behaviour is a field of study that investigates the impact that individuals, groups, and structures have on organisational behaviours to apply such knowledge to improve an organisation's effectiveness.

It is a common observation that groups rarely remain as static entities; they change over time as people change and also through training interventions. We now discuss the group building frameworks or models for group development.

## GROUP DEVELOPMENT MODELS AND THEIR SCOPE

Early human history shows that groups were at work in food gathering and other tasks. So, workgroups have existed for hundreds of years, even when the definition of a group was not developed. Merely understanding groups and models does not make groups, and more so a performing group (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). The understanding needs the backing of the organisation, the willingness of team members and facilitators, and the investment of time and energy.

Group development frameworks and interventions are used in several situations with increasing diversity, inclusion, gender safety and protection policies, and changing labour laws (The Industrial Relations Code, 2020) as both a regular team-building exercise and when organisations experience change or challenge. The ability of organisations to be skilled

at high-performance teams is a major key to competitive advantage and may very well determine the future success or failure of many organisations (Warrick, 2014). The payoffs of teamwork have been documented and affirmed (see Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; LaFasto & Larson, 2001; McShane & Von Glinow, 2010). Currently, work teams are increasingly studied by virtue of the advantages they have in an organisational setup. However, a team does not appear overnight but must be promoted and built over a period, focusing on its task at hand and the relations built around the work and group members (Raluca & Romulus, 2016).

Group formation does not happen in isolation. The membership, structure, and activities keep changing to adjust to internal changes or external demands (Worchel, 1992). Therefore, team development is not just a one-size-fits-all endeavour (Tibbs & Apperson, 2024) or a one-time affair but an ongoing exercise. Organisation scholars have suggested (Pareek, 2004; Vaida & Serban, 2021), and others have mentioned, some models such as the Johari Window, Tuckman's stages of development model (Tuckman, 1965), and David Kolb's Experiential Learning Cycle (a four-stage model), among others.

Individuals in an organisation may be helped by one-on-one counselling, hand-holding, workshops, or collective training inputs and learning experiences. The group development model may use instruments and techniques that will cater to the needs, such as role clarification and responsibilities; improve relationships among members; explore creative solutions; improve motivation, communication, and co-operation; and reduce conflicts. In effect, team development recognises the individual and the team as a whole to improve aspects of teamwork such as goal setting, communication, conflict resolution, problem solving, accountability, and motivation (Coursera, 2024). Let us briefly discuss selected approaches to group development.

## **TUCKMAN'S MODEL OF GROUP DEVELOPMENT**

'Tuckman's Five Stages of Team Development' approach is well known, where Bruce W. Tuckman (1965) distinguished four key phases. Most theories of organisational group development focus on identifying a sequence of evolution that groups go through from the moment they are created until their dissolution. To explain the process of group formation, most publications rely on the model developed by Tuckman and subsequently completed (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977). The stages described are forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning. This approach, with its phases or stages, helps teams review themselves and can assist team members in completing tasks both individually and collectively. These phases allow teams to evaluate and, if needed, modify their structure. These phases also serve

as a road map to achieve the group's goal or objective. The speed at which teams move through these stages depends on many factors, including the expectations of team members, individuals on the team, leadership, and the team's overall goal. However, we must note that these are not linear, sequential stages but sometimes overlapping.

The model has been taken over and developed over the years in various approaches in management theory and in theory on organisational behaviour, and includes five (originally four) stages or phases in the evolution of a group (Coulter, 2005). The model has been empirically tested (Runkel et al., 1971), and the findings confirmed the four-stage model; however, there has been doubt about whether the results may not be reliable because of the researchers' methodology. The bulk of the literature from 1965 to the present has been theoretical in nature. It is also argued in favour of the model that empirical research was not primarily concerned with testing already existing models (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977). The theocratic framework of this model certainly helps understand group and their dynamics as they evolve.

## **Goals, Roles, Processes, and Interpersonal Relationships (GRPI) Model**

The GRPI model is a basic framework for group development and for reviewing group effectiveness. The model is once again theoretical and helps us to understand and divide the group into four major layers in well-functioning work groups. The GRPI model was created by organisational theorist Dick Beckhard to aid in the diagnosis of team dysfunction (Tartell, 2016). The GRPI model visualises four key organisational components categorised into a pyramid-shaped hierarchy (Hajdari & Njomza, 2024). The model has a premise that interpersonal relationships are important in the group, and the commonly called 'people problems' are actually design problems. Simply put, the model informs us that a group effort is towards achieving goals, while the efforts, namely, who does what, the role allocation in the group, and how work and decisions flow in the group, are the processes. If these four layers are well designed and taken care of, one can prevent a substantial number of interpersonal frictions.

Morton Deutsch's work examines how co-operative or competitive aims influence whether disagreements result in constructive growth or destructive, harmful effects. He argues that disagreement is natural in groups and, when facilitated well through co-operation, may be beneficial (Deutsch, 1973). It must be noted that although conflict drains the energy of the group, "however, conflicts are not necessarily dysfunctional" (Pareek, 2004: 511).

The model provides a crucial framework for examining a group and how it functions, as well as some guidance for more successful dispute resolution. Aside from the four

layers, other internal and external elements influencing organisations and groups include social identity, culture, gender orientation, systems, and so on (Dabhi, 2008, 2017). Moreover, goals, roles, processes, and relations are not static and have different perspectives of group members and thus dialogue among group members and facilitation becomes important. Overemphasis on goals, roles, and processes may not address trust deficits and exclusion in the diverse groups. For a workshop, this model may help provide some clarifications and understanding of group layers, but not the healing of entrenched interpersonal conflicts. GRPI will provide a complementary training methodology. A method to facilitate is important, and the model alone does not provide that methodology.

## Group Psychotherapy

Group psychotherapy developed from psychotherapy. Group therapy was one of the first approaches used as an attempt to close the psychotherapy treatment gap. Group therapy was adopted as a treatment approach in the period after the Second World War, when there was a sudden increase in the number of clients who required mental health services but not enough practitioners to provide these services.

The basic principles of psychotherapy trace the common thread in all psychotherapy approaches: behavioural, cognitive, psychodynamic, strategic, and humanistic, and define this 'essence' as a set of essential principles (Cummings, 2000). Group psychotherapy is widely used in medical settings and organisations. Reid (1980) emphasises the concept of repair, which is the release of emotional energy that allows the participants to efficiently adapt to their social and emotional environments. Reid also describes the characteristics that therapists must possess, noting that those in training have special challenges.

The American Psychological Association recently recognised group psychotherapy as a distinct specialty (Whittingham et al., 2021). Group therapy draws on psychotherapy, in which one or two therapists deal with several participants at once. Group psychotherapy is implemented in different types, but it is usually performed in a group of eight to 10 participants. The role of the facilitator is to guide and manage the group's conversation or problem solving to promote personal growth and positive behavioural change. In addition, paying attention to cohesion and group process is an important part of the group therapist's skillset (Malat et al., 2024). Core elements include the group leader's role in fostering group cohesion; receptive and expressive aspects of empathy; and interpersonal feedback and interpreting communication that might be nonverbal, implicit, or explicit (Mahon & Leszcz, 2017).

The group members assist one another by leading, offering constructive criticism, and offering helpful guidance and support (Malat et al., 2024). The group works together to enhance each individual's strengths and self-awareness. Evidence suggests that group psychotherapy is as successful as individual psychotherapy; thus, this method has the potential to be less expensive and increase access to psychotherapy in underprivileged communities (Riedl et al., 2023; Groenewald et al., 2019). It is also suggested that it is widely used as an intensive treatment modality to address psychological issues, especially those involving unsatisfactory interpersonal patterns. Group therapy is also used in a more structured manner to address negative cognition and unsatisfactory interpersonal relations, to learn skills such as assertiveness, and for psychoeducational purposes (MacKenzie, 2002).

The major difference between individual therapy and group therapy from a process viewpoint is the presence of a range of relationships rather than the single relationship of individual therapy. This makes groups a more complex treatment system and has led to the idea of therapy through the group process rather than therapy of the individual in the group or therapy provided solely by the leader. The role of a leader in a group is quite a different task from the role of the individual therapist. The leader must be monitoring each member as well as the general climate of the group (MacKenzie, 2002).

The limitation of group therapy is that it has greater potential for leader dependency (Ladwig et al., 2014; Linden, 2013). It focuses on one person at a time, and thus the therapist's time is shared, meaning less focused, personalised care for each patient. Harpaz (1994) emphasises the influence of the leader and skill in dynamics that are intrinsic to a well-functioning group. The flexibility of the group and group process may be restricted. It is therapeutic in nature, and the individuals are expected to share their difficulties. Another possible limitation implies the loss of trust, and this aspect appears to be vital in the context of the dynamics of therapy. Participants tend to feel comfortable and reveal more intimate information about themselves in the case of a one-on-one conversation (Jónsson & Hougaard, 2009). The overall result is that it focuses on individuals and not the group as a whole, and to that extent, group development is limited. The focus is on problem solving and much less on group development.

## HUMAN PROCESS TRAINING LABORATORY – AN EXPERIENTIAL MODEL

The HPTL model, sometimes known as T-group learning, is an experiential-based model. The model emphasises here

and now data generated from the group to work on, and not past or hypnotised data. This model of learning draws from applied behavioural science as well as psychology, social psychology, sociology, and anthropology (Lewin, 1947). Psychology's contributions have been mainly at the individual or micro level of analysis, while the other disciplines have contributed to our understanding of macro concepts such as group processes and organisation (Robinsons & Judge, 2013). The training laboratory consists of a small group of eight to 10 people with one or two facilitators trained in process work.

The history of group dynamics, also called group processes (Hogg & Williams, 2000), has an underlying premise we all know, namely, 'the whole is greater than the sum of its parts'. Therefore, a group has an entity and qualities that cannot be understood just by studying the individuals in the group. In 1924 Gestalt psychologist Max Wertheimer proposed that there are entities where the behaviour of the whole cannot be derived from its individual elements nor from the way these elements fit together; instead, the opposite is true: 'the properties of any of the parts are determined by the intrinsic structural laws of the whole' (Wertheimer, 1999).

The 'Hawthorne effect', understood as the change in the behaviour of individuals when observed, is one of the main conclusions of the work carried out by Elton Mayo and his collaborators (Hassard, 2012). In this model behaviours and processes in the here and now are important. Behaviours imply physical gesture, and action; they imply what is being said and how it is being said (pitch; tone of voice; number of times said; by whom and to whom it is said; who speaks, who does not, and how long, etc.; who is talked about and to whom I and others talk to; and so on). Thus, observation of behaviour implies verifiable, quantifiable data.

Robinsons and Judge (2013) explain that processes are actions that individuals, groups, and organisations engage in as a result of inputs and that lead to certain outcomes. There are processes at an individual level, interpersonal level, and group level. At the individual level, processes include emotions and moods, motivation, perception, and decision making. At the group level, they include communication, leadership, power and politics, and conflict and negotiation. At the organisational level, processes include human resource management and change practices (Robinsons & Judge, 2013). The processes also manifested underlining beliefs, assumptions, and values people and group hold. Keen observation of behaviour and processes helps facilitators have insights of possible world view of the individual and bring that to the awareness of the group. There is also emphasis on group process observation from the lenses of exclusion and inclusion, gender, caste, religion, and class perspective as they influence human processes and relation in the group (Dabhi & Sharma, 2025).

Members and facilitators make inference to intervene in the group based on data. For example, if you notice someone with water-like substance flowing down their eyes or with wet eyes while talking about a relationship, you might conclude/infer the person is sad. In fact, the person may or may not be sad. What you see is a water-like substance in the eyes. Inference is different from the analysis of data. In HPTL (T-group), we often draw from theory-based data analysis, which entails juggling between theory and empirical data emerging (Aneshensel, 2013) from the group in our context.

Group facilitation is a process in which a person who is acceptable to group members is substantively neutral, and is trained to facilitate. The facilitator is neutral in terms of content but not the process. A facilitator is a process guide who understands group processes, observes, and diagnoses. S/he is a guide and, therefore, facilitates and does not direct processes (Thorpe, 2008; Dabhi, 2008). The facilitator's interest is not to get people to conform, cry, or feel alike but to increase their freedom of choice and behaviour (Jones, 1972).

Despite methodological deficiencies in the study, results seem to support the assumption that intellectual and emotional benefits are derived from a T-group workshop (Schutz & Allen, 1966). The limitation of this learning model is that it is unstructured causing initial stress and frustration and people give up. The trainer is a facilitator and does not train like in the other models. People who are used to class room, structured, and directive learning find it difficult to get into this form initially. The facilitators and group members may also use metaphors and theories to make sense of the data they have observed and analysis. Therefore, Tuckman's sages, Kolb's learning cycle, Joe-Hari window, Transactional Analysis, leadership styles, decision making, conflict addressal, etc. are highlighted in meaning making of the processes unfolding, drawing greater clarity on group development. The learning is not problem solving-focused but learning and empowerment focused. Put differently it is strengthening your muscles in a swimming pool so that you can swim anywhere more effectively and creatively.

## **DIFFERENCES AND HPTL'S EDGE OVER OTHER MODELS**

Having cited four models, I argue that the HPTL model has an edge over the other models in terms of its adaptability and effectiveness in various contexts. I argue for the edge in the difference, not to belittle other models but to address and act more effectively in the development of groups in the workplace, particularly by enhancing collaboration, teamwork, communication, and overall group dynamics. The purpose of highlighting the differences is to enhance clarity and comprehension of the advantages and limitations of the models under discussion. I would like the models to

be examined on a continuum, which means looking at them as part of a range of options rather than comparing them directly. The following highlights a few of the differences resulting in the edge of High-Performance Team Leadership (HPTL) over other models.

## INDIVIDUAL TO GROUP

Group development is about the collective and not merely the individuals in it. In contrast to Tuckman's and GRPI approaches, the HPTL facilitator focuses on and aids the group as a whole as well as individual members using a variety of non-directive interventions that involve observation and sharing of their behaviours. He or she fosters group exploration of why people behave the way they do. The underlying belief is that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The idiom attributed to Socrates and Gestalt, in our case, it means that a combined system has greater value, synergy, or functionality than its individual components.

Despite addressing each participant in the group, the therapist primarily works with them one after another. In contrast, HPTL may have a therapeutic effect on individuals, but the focus is on learning through participation, exposure, feedback, and interpersonal and group interactions. HPTL generates learning through interactions among group members. The interactions are alive and impacting each individual in the group differently, and providing different perspectives on the same 'happening'. The perspectives are data to examine why people are impacted differently, generating different emotions and revealing different beliefs and values people hold about the same things. The learning is a collective contribution and not just from one source. This collaborative learning, emerging from the group experience, enhances personal growth through bonding in a challenging and supportive environment. Thus, while both models employ group dynamics, they differ in goal, focus, and methodology, with one model aiming to enhance theoretical understanding and the other prioritising practical application in real-world settings.

## CONCEPTUAL TO EXPERIENTIAL

In the first two models, the frameworks are conceptual and easy to implement in a structured workshop format, in which participants are expected to understand the concepts. The focus is on clarity, understanding and expectation that the participants will implement the learnt concept for group development. In group therapy, no doubt there is an element of experiencing change. However, the focus of the group members and the therapist is on addressing the challenges and difficulties faced by individuals, leading to therapeutic outcomes. The HPTL does not dismiss ideas and notions, but rather focuses on the impact of group members on the

group and what the group does with it. The facilitator may assist the group by presenting hypotheses based on their own experiences and observations of group changes. As a result, group members not only learn about conflict resolution but also watch and address conflict in the group in real time, transforming the entire process into a learning and group-building session.

## DEPENDENCY AND INTERDEPENDENCY

In the first two models, trainers take the lead and give guidance and direction, whereas in group therapy, the therapist or counselor does the same. The HPTL model lacks structure and few instructions. In a typical group development session, the participants expect the facilitator to deliver instructions on what to do, how to do it, and when. In the HPTL paradigm, a lack of structure and direction from the facilitators causes confusion, dissatisfaction from unmet expectations, and annoyance among group participants. The typical reliance on the facilitator is challenged since facilitator conduct does not provide 'hand-holding'.

When the group realises that direction and instructions are not being elicited, their reliance on the facilitator shifts to counter-dependence and, finally, interdependence. In the first two models, the leader provides subject matter for the group to discuss, which is related to group development. In group therapy, the facilitator encourages each participant to discuss or reflect on their personal issues and challenges faced. As a result, the group remains mainly facilitator-centric.

The here and now insistence, and the unstructured and process-focused methodology, evokes a variety of emotions, including dependence and counter-dependency among members. The root of these emotions is beliefs and values underpinning these emotions, which help group members to access and analyse the belief and value system operating in the group, causing emotions that, with different belief and value systems, may not be there.

Facilitators in HPTL demonstrate a variety of interventions as s/he observes group behaviour and processes. These interventions are sometimes informally categorised as caring, directing, confronting, empowering, diagnostic, and so on. The facilitators' method has the potential to produce a high level of reliance in the group, but a skilled HPTL facilitator constantly raises group awareness of democratic, group interactions (Dabhi, 2008). The HPTL, unlike the other models, emphasises flexibility and democratic interaction because it is not directed by a trainer or facilitator.

## There and Then to Here and Now

'There' and 'then' refer to past events and situations of the group member, while 'here' and 'now' are all that takes place

in the group in the space and time the group is currently in. The Tuckman's and GRPI models begin and function on the review and status of the group's concerns. In group therapy, individual exploration of issues, concerns, and difficulties helps the facilitator to initiate group work. Historical data, both present and past, is unrestricted and provides an opportunity to rectify issues. The HPTL discourages using past data and information because current group members cannot access it, preventing interaction with data they did not experience or observe. If there was any interaction with the past data brought in, it would be assumed rather than experienced in real time by the group in the here and now. Whatever happens within the group in the current space and time is critical for everyone's understanding of the data and work. Therefore, the subject matter for the group's learning and growth is the group members themselves. The group provides information regarding the individual's immediate behaviours and their impact. By watching and analysing my behaviour and that of others, as well as by influencing the group, the group experiences the data to learn from. Power struggles, rivalry, jealousy, demeaning someone, pairing, resistance, etc. could all be reflected in the actions. Research indicates that groups can experience multiple processes simultaneously over time, exactly as described. Therefore, integrating data from individuals and groups over time is necessary for group activity analysis (Lang et al., 2019). As a result, the emphasis on completing one process before going on to the next in a T-group, whether by the facilitator or any of the group members, may impede learning from prior processes as they advance.

A quick overview of the facilitator's competency may be appropriate in this setting.

## **Competence and Skills of a Facilitator**

Each model has a distinct capability, as well as overlapping talents. In the first two models, the facilitator's theoretical grounding, comprehension, and clarification are critical for supporting group members in comprehending the principles underlying the learning at stake and applying them to the group and members' current reality. In group therapy, psychological and clinical knowledge and experience are critical in assisting patients. According to the HPTL model, professional training in process work qualifies you to moderate groups. Such professional training is provided at NTL in the United States (<https://www.ntl.org/>) and ISABS in India (<https://www.isabs.org/>), both of which I am familiar with.

In all approaches, the facilitator as a person, her/his humanness, beliefs, values, attitudes, and sociopolitical worldview influence their facilitating technique and analysis. In the Indian context, the facilitator may want to learn the democratic secular ideals of the Indian constitution, as well as

the ideology and beliefs of Varna-caste practice, patriarchy, gender (Dabhi & Sharma, 2025), and pigmentocracy (Dabhi & Tiwari, 2024), to assist participants who attend the programme. It is important to remember that facilitation necessitates educational and communication skills, as well as an understanding and access to the phenomenological world of the individual and group, which is textured by social and cultural variables in the group, and that it assists the learner in connecting with their internal capacities to learn and make sense of their experiences.

The facilitators infer the internal mental constructions that present themselves in behaviours of group members, bringing them to group consciousness so that they can be examined again and developed if useful, or unlearned if inhibiting. For example, a few members of the group are angry because a member used a certain word. The facilitator may assist the group in identifying the source of their anger. Through different interventions of members, the group may become aware that their anger arose from their perception of the value they place on such a word, its meaning, and implications. Thus, facilitation must seek to understand one's own and others' frames of reference in terms of worldview, meaning system, and sense of well-being to reflect on how knowledge is acquired through experience, utilising implicit and explicit theoretical lenses (Dabhi & Sircar, 2011).

## **Specific and Overall Development of the Group**

Every model has a unique area of expertise, methodology, and result. The forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning components of group functioning are the focus of the first two models, which use examples to assist the group in comprehending the model and its subtleties. To enhance group performance, the GRPI model makes the group, role, process, and impact on group members clearer. For the group to work well, group therapy tackles individual issues as well as those of the group as a whole. To recognise and process group dynamics at different phases, which may not be linear, the HPTL model integrates several current theories of group formation. Individual competition, hostility, and pessimism are similar to Tuckman's second stage, 'storming' (Lacerenza et al., 2018). The 'norming' stage may be used to explain emotional worries and intense affection (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977). Teamwork processes, that is, "interdependent acts that convert inputs to outcomes through cognitive, verbal, and behavioural activities directed towards organising taskwork to achieve collective goals" (Marks et al., 2001: 357), are what enable teams to produce results greater than the sum of the contributions of individual members (Stagl et al., 2006).

Power is handled more skillfully with HPTL than with the other variant. When discussing uncertainty, Bennis (1964) focuses on how group members feel about authority or,

more broadly, how power is handled and distributed within the group. Members' orientations towards each other make up the second. These two orientations – the authority and intimacy individuals bring to the group – are linked to the main concerns or problems the group encounters and resolves.

Dysfunctional behaviour in the group is frequently ignored unless it is conceptually brought up or discussed individually during treatment. While destructive competitiveness, emotional exploitation, or retreat are typical reactions to peers, HPTL addresses issues such as rebelliousness, submissiveness, or withdrawal as typical reactions to authority figures. Bennis (1964) proposes that these behaviours, which are dictated by these two orientations, have two general outcomes: a) enslavement of the other in the service of the self and b) enslavement of the self in the service of the other or situation dissolution. As a result, they obstruct group procedures and progress towards common objectives (Bennis, 1964). Many of us have personally witnessed how these obstruct group autonomy, growth, and empowerment. Warren's conceptual clarity is beneficial and clarifies our group process discussion.

The HPTL has an edge over other models in group development despite its limitations. The group and the individual inside and through the group are given more attention. It encourages increased interdependency between members and the facilitators and challenges facilitator dependence. Learning is prioritised over problem-solving.

## CONCLUSION

We have briefly examined four models, outlining the framework, benefits and drawbacks. The article demonstrated the contrasts between the models and highlighted the advantage that the HPTL had in group development. Drawing on his own experience, the author would like to emphasise that each model has a purpose and application in the world of organisation. The model's fitness will be determined by the type of organisation and the needs of the group and its members. Organisations that can afford it may use all of the models at various times and locations.

In light of the complexity of society and organisations, it is advocated that organisations and their cultures be more adaptable, proactive, and inclusive. There is no one-size-fits-all approach to organisational and group development. Humans are not machines, and each individual has distinct characteristics, needs, and orientations. In the world of knowledge creation and artificial intelligence (AI) at people's fingertips, mere cognitive theories and concepts through workshops, lectures, and classroom inputs are not adequate for human development of the group and the organisation. The various models discussed have a conceptual framework,

and they are useful for the group in its ongoing formation. There might be a few in the group who may require therapy, and the organisation should not hesitate to provide that facility with members' consensus.

However, for general functioning and regular engagement with group effectiveness and development, process-centred training such as HPTL may enhance the human capital and competencies of the group. Besides, such a kind of training will meet the human need to reassess individual style of relating, interacting, and behaving in group contexts, where each one shares in the life of the group and the organisation at the same time the same person lives and interacts with family and social settings. Humans must pay attention to and evolve in this setting of a rapidly evolving world of technology and AI. Human beings are actors and should stay so; they are currently subjugated by new societal innovations. In today's world, the health of the individual, group, and organisation is critical. That is why I advocate HPTL as part of the continual building of groups.

The underlying appeal in the article is that the HPTL may be considered across businesses if training and development opportunities at work are perceived to benefit both employee well-being and organisational performance (Grawitch et al., 2006). Because HPTL combines diverse information systems, human faculties (cognitive, emotive, and behavioural), and learning methods, the model has a broader scope and reaches different types of groups and organisations. Of course, the model and its approach cannot be imposed; they must be accepted by the group.

## REFERENCES

- Abraham, C., Conner, M., Jones, F., & O'Connor, D. (2016). *Health psychology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Routledge, London.
- Alford H. J. & Naughton, M. J. (2001). *Managing as if faith mattered: Christian social principles in the modern organisation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Aneshensel, C. S. (2013). *Theory-based data analysis for the social sciences* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Log Angeles: Sage Publication.
- Baker, D. P., Day, R., & Salas, E. (2006). Teamwork as an essential component of high-reliability organizations. *Health Serv Res.*, 41(4 Pt 2), 1576–1598. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6773.2006.00566.x>. PMID: 16898980; PMCID: PMC1955345.
- Bennis, W. G. (1966). Organizational revitalization. *California Management Review*, 9(1), 51–60.
- Blumer, Herbert. (1969). *Symbolic Interaction: Perspective and Method*. University of California Press.
- Bradshaw, B., & Roberts, P. (Eds.). (2003). *British consciousness and identity: The making of Britain* (pp. 1533–1707). Cambridge University Press.

- Bruce, W. T. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63(6), 384–399.
- Cartwright, D., & Alvin, Z. (Eds.). (1968). *Group dynamics: Research and theory* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). London: Tavistock Publications.
- Coulter, M. K. (2005). *Strategic management in action*. Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Coursera. (2024). What is team development? Definition, stages, and more. *Courses*. Retrieved from <https://www.coursera.org/enterprise/articles/team-development>
- Cummings, N. A. (2000). *The essence of psychotherapy reinventing the art for the new era of data* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Imprint: Academic Press.
- Dabhi, J. C., & Sharma, I. (2025). Discrimination and dehumanization hidden in diversity. News Letter *HERE & NOW*, January 2025, of Indian Society for Applied Behaviour Science (ISABS), India. Retrieved from [www.isabs.com](http://www.isabs.com)
- Dabhi, J. C., & Tiwari, R. (2021, April). Pigmentocracy – What is the colour of your skin? News Letter *HERE & NOW* (pp. 13-17). Indian Society for Applied Behaviour Science (ISABS), India. Retrieved from [www.isabs.com](http://www.isabs.com)
- Dabhi, J. C. (2008). Organizational culture and NGO performance. In M. Jain & P. Sarathi (Eds.), *Annual Handbook of Human Resource Initiatives* (pp. 166–179). Delhi: Initiatives and Interventions.
- Dabhi, J. C. (2017). Institutional cultural pollution in India: The merging of social and organisational cultures. *Social Action*, 67(4), 370–380.
- Dabhi, J. C., & Sircar, S. (2011). Process interventions – Individual vs group, does it matter? In M. Jain & P. Sarathi (Eds.), *Annual Handbook of Human Resource Initiatives* (pp. 19–35). Delhi: Initiatives and Interventions.
- Dabhi, J. (2005). Gendered socialization. *Women's Link*, 11(1), 24–31. New Delhi: A Social Action Trust.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 17(2), 248. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/000276427301700206> (Original work published 1973).
- George, S. (2006). *Knowing knowledge*. Publisher: Lulu.com. Retrieved from <https://books.google.co.in/books?id=Pj41TomgKXYC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Grawitch, M. J., Gottschalk, M., & Munz, D. C. (2006). The path to a healthy workplace: A critical review linking healthy workplace practices, employee well-being, and organizational improvements. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 58, 129–147.
- Groenewald, E., Joska, J., & Araya, R. (2019). Psychotherapy adaptation in aging populations. In D. J. Stein, J. K. Bass, & S. G. Hofmann (Eds.), *Global Mental Health and Psychotherapy: Adapting Psychotherapy for Low- and Middle-Income Countries* (pp. 321–340). Elsevier Academic Press. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-814932-4.00015-X>
- Hajdari, R., & Jupa, N. (2024). The role of pyramidal organizational structure in organizational efficiency and effectiveness. *ACC JOURNAL*, 29, 7–22. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2478/acc-2023-0001>
- Harpaz, N. (1994). Failures in group psychotherapy: The therapist variable. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 44(1), 3–19.
- Hassard, J. S. (2012). Rethinking the Hawthorne studies: The western electric research in its social, political and historical context. *Human Relations*, 65(11), 1431–1461. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726712452168> (Original work published 2012)
- Hill, W. F., & Gruner, L. (1973). A study of development in open and closed groups. *Small Group Behavior*, 4(3), 355–381.
- Hogg, M. A., & Williams, K. D. (2000). From I to we: Social identity and the collective self. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 4(1), 81–97. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.4.1.81>
- <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=40f322d5916b792db69e58855713163461ce5655>
- Jones, J. E. (1972). Types of growth groups. In J. W. Pfeiffer & J. E. Jones (Eds.), *The 1972 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators*. Pfeiffer & Co.
- Jónsson, H., & Hougaard, E. (2009). Group cognitive behavioural therapy for obsessive-compulsive disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 119(2), 98–106.
- Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning development*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lacerenza, C. N., Shannon, L. M., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Salas, E. (2018). Team development interventions: Evidence-based approaches for improving teamwork. *American Psychological Association*. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/manuscript/2018-23205-017.pdf>
- Ladwig, I., Rief, W., & Nestoriuc, Y. (2014). Welche risiken und nebenwirkungen hat psychotherapie? – entwicklung des inventars zur erfassung negativer effekte von psychotherapie (INEP). *Verhaltenstherapie*, 24(4), 252–263. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1159/000367928>
- LaFasto, F., & Larson, C. (2001). *When teams work best*. New Delhi: Sage Publication. Retrieved from <https://books.google.co.in/books?hl=en&lr=&id=GAPaVodfwoG&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=4.+LaFasto+and+Larson+m>

- odel&ots=1gHTJjJW8I&sig=1Dyua\_44T2tzi8YR1Yuhzk\_QOE4#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Lang, J. W. B., Bliese, P. D., & Adler, A. B. (2019:). Opening the black box: A multilevel framework for studying group processes. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 2(3), 271–287. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918823722
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: concept, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations*, 1, 5–41. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/001872674700100103
- Linden, M. (2013). How to define, find and classify side effects in psychotherapy: From unwanted events to adverse treatment reactions. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 20(4), 286–296. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.1765
- MacKenzie, K. R. (2002). *Group psychotherapy*, 891.
- Mahon, L., & Leszcz, M. (2017). The interpersonal model of group psychotherapy. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 67(sup1), S121–S130. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/00207284.2016.1218286
- Malat, J., Cheng, S. E. T., & Tay, A. T. S. (2024). Group psychotherapy. In A. Tasman et al. *Tasman's Psychiatry*. Cham: Springer. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-51366-5\_37
- Markman Art. (2015). How groups shape individual judgment. *Greater Good Magazine*. Retrieved from [https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/how\\_groups\\_shape\\_judgment](https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/how_groups_shape_judgment)
- Marks, M. A., Mathieu, J. E., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2001). A temporally based framework and taxonomy of team processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3), 356–376.
- McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2010). *Organizational behavior*. Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Pareek, U. (2004). *Understanding organization behaviour*. Oxford University Press.
- Raluca, Z., & Romulus, V. (2016). Work group development models – The evolution from simple group to effective team. *Ecoforum*, 5(1), 241. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299563074\\_Work\\_group\\_development\\_models\\_-\\_the\\_evolution\\_from\\_simple\\_group\\_to\\_effective\\_team](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299563074_Work_group_development_models_-_the_evolution_from_simple_group_to_effective_team)
- Reid, W. H. (1980). *Basic intensive psychotherapy*. Routledge Revivals.
- Riedl, D., Labek, K., Gstrein, I., Rothmund, M. S., Sperner-Unterweger, B., & Kantner-Rumplmair, W. (2023). Large improvement of mental health during in outpatient short-term group psychotherapy treatment-a naturalistic pre-/post-observational study. *Neuropsychiatry*, 37(2), 57–64.
- Robinsons, S. P. & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational behaviour*. Boston: Pearson. Retrieved from [https://digilib.stekom.ac.id/assets/dokumen/ebook/feb\\_c5d15cc7c32d4985a70c200bad-26dc576781601d\\_1648649445.pdf](https://digilib.stekom.ac.id/assets/dokumen/ebook/feb_c5d15cc7c32d4985a70c200bad-26dc576781601d_1648649445.pdf)
- Runkel, P. J., Lawrence, M., Oldfield, S., Rider, M., & Clark, C. (1971). Stages of group development: An empirical test of Tuckman's hypothesis. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 7(2), 180–193.
- Schaefer, R. T. (2010). *Sociology: A brief introduction* (12<sup>th</sup> ed.). McGraw-Hill US Higher Education.
- Schutz, W. C., & Allen, V. L. (1966). The effects of a T-group laboratory on interpersonal behavior. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 2(3), 265–286. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/002188636600200302 (Original work published 1966).
- Stagl, K. C., Shawn, Burke, C., Salas, E., & Pierce, L. (2006). Team adaptation: Realizing team synergy. In *Understanding Adaptability: A Prerequisite for Effective Performance within Complex Environments* (pp. 117–141). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Swann, W., Jetten, J., Gómez, A., Whitehouse, H., & Bastian, B. (2012). When group membership gets personal: A theory of identity fusion. *Psychological Review*, 119, 441–56. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028589
- Tartell, R. (2016). Understand teams by using the GRPI Model, in training on 4 January 2016. Retrieved from <https://trainingmag.com/understand-teams-by-using-the-grpi-model/>
- The Industrial Relationscode. (2020). *Bill No. 120 of 2020, as Introduced in Lok Sabha*.
- Thorpe, S. T. (2008). The use of story in building online group relationships. *Handbook of Research on Computer Mediated Communication* (pp. 551–559). doi:https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-59904-863-5.ch040
- Tibbs, S., & Apperson, K. (2024). *The power of investing in team development for organizational success*. Retrieved from <https://www.icf.com/insights/workforce/team-development-key-organizational-success>
- Tohidi, H. (2011). Teamwork productivity & effectiveness in an organization base on rewards, leadership, training, goals, wage, size, motivation, measurement and information technology. *Procedia Computer Science*, 3, 1137–1146. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2010.12.185
- Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63(6), 384.
- Tuckman, B. W., & Jensen, M. A. C. (1977). Stages of small-group development revisited. *Group and Organizational*

- Studies*, 2(4), 419–27. Retrieved from [http://www.communicationcache.com/uploads/1/0/8/8/10887248/stages\\_of\\_small-group\\_development\\_revisited.pdf](http://www.communicationcache.com/uploads/1/0/8/8/10887248/stages_of_small-group_development_revisited.pdf)
- Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63(6), pp. 384–399. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0022100>
- Vaida, S. & Serban, D. (2021). Group development stages: A brief comparative analysis of various models. *Studia Ubb Psychol.-Paed.*, 66(1), 91–110. doi:<https://doi.org/10.24193/Subbypsyped.2021.1.05>
- Warren, G. B. (1964). Patterns and vicissitudes in T-Group development. In Bradford, (Eds.), *T-Group Theory and the Laboratory Method*. New York: John Wiley.
- Warrick, D. D. (2014). What leaders can learn about teamwork and developing high performance teams. *Organization Development Practitioners*, 46(3), 69–75.
- Wertheimer, M. (1999, November). Gestalt Theory by Max Wertheimer (1924) First published in *Gestalt Theory*, 21(3), 181–183.
- Westheimer, G. (1999). Gestalt theory reconfigured: Max Wertheimer's anticipation of recent developments in visual neuroscience. *Perception*, 28(1), 5-15.
- Whittingham, M., Lefforge, N. L., & Marmarosh, C. (2021). Group psychotherapy as a specialty: An inconvenient truth. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 74(2), 60–66. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.20200037>
- Worchel, S. (1992). Beyond a commodity theory analysis of censorship: When abundance and personalism enhance scarcity effects. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 13(1), 79–92. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834baspp1301\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834baspp1301_7)