

5-1949

The Report of the Congress Observers...

John W. Keltner
University of Oklahoma

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/gavel>



Part of the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Keltner, J. W. (1949). The report of the congress observers... The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho, 31(4), 69-76.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho by an authorized editor of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

The Report of the Congress Observers . . .

JOHN W. KELTNER

Sponsor, University of Oklahoma Chapter

Three general tasks faced the corps of observers at the Fourth Biennial Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho. Our first responsibility was to help the committees in their techniques of deliberation over the several matters that were assigned. Our second charge was to collect some data to help us understand how committees work. Our third objective was to describe how our committees actually worked in this Congress. We are here presenting a preliminary report of the result of our observations and study of the committee operation at our Congress. These observations and studies are largely the result of the outstanding and skilled assistance of the eight observers from Northwestern University: Messrs. Albert Croft, Ralph Haugen, James Huffman, Winston Jones, Robert Lang (WR), Howard Martin, Liston Tatum, and Robert Weiss (A). We acknowledge a debt of gratitude to these men for their conscientious and willing work with our committees.

I. THE PRELIMINARY TRAINING OF THE OBSERVERS.

Some weeks before the congress convened, a special article entitled "How an Observer Can Help a Committee" was prepared and published in the March issue of this Journal.¹ [*The Gavel* Vol. 31, No. 3, March 1949. Pp 45-46.] This article aimed to outline and to open up the procedure whereby observers could operate in our congress. Each of the observers was given a copy of this article and asked to read it carefully with an eye to implementing the procedures discussed there.

On the day previous to the opening of the Congress the eight observers and their chairman met at Northwestern to undergo a preliminary training session for their work. At this meeting copies of the "Outline for Group Observation" developed by the National Training Laboratory in Group Development were distributed to the observers and a study of its contents made.² ["Report of the Second Summer Laboratory Session" National Training Laboratory in Group Development. Bulletin No. 3. N.E.A. 1948. P. 123ff.] This outline in brief covered the following areas of committee study.

- I. Group Characteristics
 - A. Background
 - B. Participation
 - C. Communication
 - D. Cohesion and groupings
 - E. Atmosphere
 - F. Group Standards
- II. Group Progress
 - A. Setting of goals
 - B. Steps toward goal
 - C. Procedures for group progress
 - D. Feedback and group self-evaluation
- III. Member Behavior
 - A. Behavior of designated leader
 - B. Social sensitivity and characteristics
 - C. Leadership skills and techniques
 - D. Personality observation
 - E. Member roles

1. Group centered roles
2. Task centered roles
3. Individual centered roles

The observers and the chairman discussed each of the major areas in this outline and considered methods and materials that could be used in bringing these ideas to bear in analyzing and studying the committees.

The second training session for the observers was held at the Congress Hotel on Friday morning during the first general session of the Congress. At this time the group underwent what is known as the "dry run". Half the group was assigned the task of acting as observers, and the other half was given a problem to discuss. Each member of the discussion group was taken aside by the trainer and assigned a particular attitude and role to play in the discussion. The discussion was then started. After about twenty minutes we called a halt to the proceedings and made an analysis of what had been happening as an observer would do in the regular session. This process was then repeated, with the observers in the first dry-run taking the parts of the group in this second practice.

By the time we had completed these "dry-run" sessions we were up against the 10:30 convening of the regular committees of the Congress. So, armed with the information and techniques drawn from the training period and warmed up by the practice in the "dry-run", we spread out to the various sessions.

II. THE MATERIALS AND METHODS OF THE OBSERVERS.

A. The Feedback

This was the process described in the March article whereby the observer helped the group develop its procedure by feeding in questions and reviews of what had been done and how the process of the committee was operating. Each observer was carefully instructed not to volunteer any feedback unless it was requested by the committee, or unless he felt that he just could restrain himself no longer.

B. The General Report

Each observer prepared a comprehensive account of what happened in his committee session. He made a separate report for each of the morning and afternoon sessions. The general outline of this report was based on the National Training Laboratory outline given above.

C. The Summary Report

In order to expedite the handling of the raw material and to aid in identifying particular problems and trends in the committee sessions, a special summary sheet was prepared especially for these sessions. (see copy of this sheet at the end of this report.) Entitled "Observer's Report" the sheets covered the following items: 1. Number of observations made; 2. Type of material reported in the observations to the committee; 3. Evidence of the committee's use of the observations; 4. General structure of the group; 5. Personnel; and 6. A gen-

eral summary of procedures used by the committee.

At the end of each committee session the observer made out this report and handed it to the observer chairman. In several instances these reports enabled us to see and predict tendencies that were to develop in subsequent sessions of the committees.

D. The Committee Questionnaire.

A special form of questionnaire for this Congress was devised to collect the opinions of the several committee groups as to the progress and development of their committee. This questionnaire was filled out by the members of each committee at the close of each of the sessions. The observer then took these questionnaires and summarized them on a special tally sheet and incorporated them into his final report. It was through this device that we were able to note several factors of personal dissatisfaction with the groups and to predict conflicts and disturbances that appeared later.

III. THE ROLE OF THE FEEDBACK.

One of the first items that we were interested in concerned the number and nature of the feedbacks made by the observer in the general committee sessions. A summary of the number of feedbacks will be found in table I. below.

TABLE I.
Summary of Number of Feedbacks

Observer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Requested by	0	2	1	3	3	1	0	2	A.M.
Chairman	0	0	2	4	4	2	1	3	P.M.
Requested by	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	A.M.
a member	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	3	P.M.
Initiated by	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	A.M.
observer	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	P.M.
Total observations requested by the chairmen:									28
Total observations requested by members:									12
Total observations initiated by the observer:									6
AM observations requested by the chairmen:									12
PM observations requested by the chairmen:									16
AM observations requested by members:									3
PM observations requested by members:									9
AM observations initiated by observers:									1
PM observations initiated by observers:									5

(AM and PM are used to designate the two main sessions of each committee. AM represents the morning sessions, and PM represents the afternoon session.)

The nature of the feedbacks was also of concern to the observers. A summary of the types of feedback is found in Table II.

TABLE II.
The Nature of the Feedbacks

Observer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Parliamentary matters	0	1	3	6	1	2	2	0	15
Goal processes	0	2	1	1	4	1	1	3	13
Group unity	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	6
Group atmosphere	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Progress to goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Conflicts	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4

Personnel relations	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Leader functions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4

It was rather difficult for the observers to record the reactions to the feedbacks. In some cases it was impossible for them to determine how the group reacted. Certain of the cases were clearly discernible, however, and they are reported below.

Favorable reactions: 29. This means that the group took the observation and made use of it in developing its procedures.

Neutral or undecided reactions: 7. This means that the group did not give much thought to the observation nor did it use the information for procedural improvement and growth.

Negative reactions: 3. This means that the group responded in such a way as to oppose or resent the observers remarks.

From the general reports of the observers we believe that the feedback played an important part in aiding the groups to move forward. In one case there were no feedbacks at all. The observer reported in this case that the group was quite able to get along without help. In other cases groups did not use their observer as much as necessary to perform the greatest good. Probably too much dependence for advice on parliamentary procedure was placed on the observer. It is believed that the role of the observer is not that of a parliamentarian. However, this matter is one that is open for debate; and no group should be condemned for using the observer to get it out of parliamentary wrangles. In most cases, however, the observers' feedbacks were well accepted and the groups attempted to use them to advantage. From the evidence we have compiled, it would seem that the assistance of the observer definitely aided several of the groups to move to a very valuable report.

IV. THE ROLE OF THE COMMITTEE QUESTIONNAIRE.

A complete analysis of the questionnaire would be a lengthy paper of itself. We shall attempt here to summarize the data and to point out some of the major trends that are shown by this analysis.

Item 1. on the questionnaire asked, "How did you feel this meeting was today". Each person was asked to mark a scale running from one to ten. One on the scale represented *no good*; Four on the scale represented *mediocre*; Seven on the scale represented *good*; and ten on the scale represented *excellent*. The average rating for each group is reported in Table III. (Note that group 1 is absent in this report. The study is defective here because of an incomplete report from the observer of that group.)

TABLE III.

Group	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
AM	4.3	7.0	7.4	4.7	6.7	6.6	7.0
PM	6.7	7.3	8.3	6.5	8.8	6.3	8.0
Change	2.4*	.3	.9	1.8*	2.1*	-.3	2.0*

* The starred items note groups that made a change of proportions large enough for us to suggest that the group made a definite improvement and that the second meeting was better than the first in the eyes of the group members.

Item 2 on the questionnaire asked, "Did you

find yourself wanting to say things during the meeting that you didn't actually say?" Again we used a scale from one to ten. Note that when a member marked the scale close to the ten end, it would indicate that he was keeping or being kept quiet *when he wanted to talk*. (See sample of the questionnaire at the end of this report). The average rating for each group is found in table IV.

TABLE IV.

Group	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
AM	3.7	4.3	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.7	2.8
PM	4.1	2.2	4.5	4.6	3.8	4.3	2.6
Change	-.4	2.1*	-.5	-.1	.2	-.6	.2

*The starred items note changes of proportions large enough to indicate that there were distinct trends in the groups toward better or worse *personal orientation and participation*.

Item 5 was stated as follows: "To what extent were the things you personally hoped to get out of the meeting different from what the group was trying to accomplish?" The scale was again from one to ten. One on the scale represented completely opposed; four, somewhat opposed; seven, fairly opposed; and ten, identical. The average rating for each group is found in Table V.

TABLE V.

Group	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
AM	7.2	6.7	7.4	4.7	6.5	6.8	8.3
PM	7.3	6.1	7.3	5.8	8.1	6.4	8.2
Change	.1	-.6	-.1	1.1*	1.6*	-.4	-.1

*The starred items note changes of such proportions to indicate that the members of the group were more personally satisfied with the second meeting than the first in terms of their own personal objectives for the committee work.

Item 6 on the questionnaire asked, "How fully do you think the members were in accord with what the group was trying to accomplish today?" The scale was from one to ten. One indicated a small minority in accord; four, a large minority; seven, a good majority; and ten, completely in accord. The average rating for each group will be found in Table VI.

TABLE VI.

Group	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
AM	7.4	6.0	7.5	6.0	7.0	8.4	7.2
PM	8.1	7.8	6.7	6.4	6.7	6.7	7.8
Change	.7*	1.8*	-.8*	.4	-.3	-1.7*	.6

*Starred items indicate shifts of opinion that seem to show that rather distinct changes were taking place in the group from one meeting to the next. A negative sign indicated that the group was getting less agreement in the second session than in the first.

Item 7 asked, "How satisfied are you with the decisions reached by this group at *this* session?" One on the scale represented very satisfied; four, satisfied; seven, dissatisfied; and ten, very dissatisfied. The average rating for each group is found in table VII.

TABLE VII.

Group	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
AM	6.1	4.5	4.0	5.7	4.7	2.8	3.1
PM	3.2	4.2	3.7	5.7	3.0	4.2	2.8
Change	2.9*	.3	.3	0	1.7*	-1.4*	.3

*Starred items indicate shifts of opinion that seem to indicate a change in the achievement of the group. Note particularly group 7. This group broke down completely in the final half of the final session.

A general examination of the above tables will show the following things:

1. That the majority of the groups felt that the second meeting was better than the first.
2. That groups two and seven had fewer people getting to say what they wished in the second session than in the first.
3. That group three had considerably more people getting to say what they wished in the second session than in the first.
4. That groups five and six were composed of people who in the second session found the group working more to their own objectives as a whole.
5. That groups two and three found greater accord with the work of the committee among the members in the second session than in the first.
6. That groups four and seven found less accord with the committee among the members in the second session.
7. That groups two and six indicated much greater satisfaction with the second session than the first.
8. That group seven indicated much less satisfaction with the second session than with the first.

The interesting thing about all this is that as we check these results against the general reports of the observers, we can find a high correlation of results. This indicates that what the observers saw was actually happening as far as the members themselves could report.

V. THE OBSERVER'S REPORT.

It would be impossible for us to indicate the large bulk of material collected and reported by our observers. We shall attempt, therefore, to summarize briefly the major elements in each observer's report. We are purposely trying to avoid identifying the groups throughout this whole report. Our objective is to keep our data as removed as far as possible from the personal interpretation of the people who attended the convention.

A. The Report of Observer 1.

1. A. M.

An implicit schism in the group developed in the morning session revolving around two opposing philosophies of freedom. The group as a whole did not recognize the danger of this split. In spite of this the group worked together fairly well. The chairman dominated the group and spoke most frequently. Four other persons framed the main discussion section. The rest of the group was relatively inactive. About five of the sixteen members of the committee made practically no contribution. There was one constant dissenter in the group who opposed everything. Frequent indecision and confusion resulted because of failure to clarify just what the goals of the committee were. There was some personal antagonism but it did not persist. Little actual factual material was brought into the discussion. The group often got off the main topic and became involved in minor and irrelevant matters. There was much waste of time in the use of burdensome parliamentary methods. The group failed to see goals of any kind.

2. P. M.

Definite changes and improvements were noted in the afternoon session. The lead-

er, however, still did much of the talking and made many of the decisions. There remained a basic core of persons who dominated the participation. The group made considerable progress in developing a unity. The schism of the morning was overcome; and when apparent conflicts would arise, the group would take steps to integrate the varying opinions. The group thus became more "group centered". There was less personal conflict and control. While there were still no explicit goals, a clear, implicit goal developed under the guidance of several members of the group who had met during lunch to determine procedure for the afternoon session. Upon discovery that all were working in the same direction the speed and efficiency of the group increased amazingly. Only two members of the group in this session were withdrawn from active participation.

B. The Report of Observer 2.

1. A. M.

Approximately one-third of the group dominated the discussion for the first hour. Eventually another third came into the discussion, but four or five persons were silent. The leader often over-participated but seemed fair in his remarks. Lack of goals led to division as to what procedure to follow. Everyone in the group felt frustrated by the bulk of bills to be studied and the lack of an efficient procedure. The group apparently did not know how to bring discussion to bear on the consideration of the problems at hand. There was quite a bit of the "play-acting" element present: too much of the cynical "big-time politician" atmosphere to allow for sound discussion. The group had no conception of what goals were or how to set them for the committee. It was sensitive to this, however; and a great deal of dissatisfaction was apparent. The bulk of the session was spent in trying to decide what to discuss and how to work with the materials. As the group tried to find itself, the formality of parliamentary procedure began to give way to more flexible informality. This was a good sign. The participation of the members remained unreal and individual-centered. This accounted for a great deal of the difficulty.

2. P. M.

In the afternoon the same five or six people dominated the discussion. Three persons made no contribution during the entire day. These people gave evidence of disgust with the proceedings. The remainder of the group contributed occasionally but were apathetic. The basic dissatisfaction with the work continued. Feedback late in the session called attention to the lack of clear goals, but the group felt that time was too short to start over. The implicit goal of "practicality" was the only one that was held as a constant criterion over the bill-by-bill considerations of the committee. After 3:30 evidence of fatigue and distraction became increasingly apparent.

C. The Report of Observer 3.

1. A. M.

Participation was limited during the early part of the session to the chairman and one or two members of the committee. The chairman and one other person dominated the entire procedure. Heavy reliance on parlia-

mentary procedure tended to cause division during the latter minutes of the meeting. The chairman set out the basic issues or goals of the committee, and the group implicitly seemed to accept them. Later, however, the group showed evidence of not understanding these because discussion over specific bills would bog down in minute details that were non-productive. The group failed to get at specific objectives and procedures, and consequently by the end of the first session only one-half of one bill had been accepted and details were stifling clear thinking.

2. P. M.

This session started out with a split over a minor issue of the first bill being considered by the group. A threat of a walkout and a minority report endangered the unity of the entire committee. The group finally resorted to vote, and a majority decision prevailed with no walkout. This was evidence of some group unity. Following this crisis the group moved smoothly. Probably things went too smoothly. There was evidence of lethargy and submission on the part of the group to the dominance of a small minority. More than forty per cent of the talking was done by two persons. The leader probably contributed more than his share and gave evidence that he did not sense the attitudes of the members in the group. The group tended to bog down in parliamentary procedure from time to time. After feedbacks suggesting that strict formality was not necessary, the discussion ran more smoothly. Several attempts were made to use the parliamentary techniques to obstruct discussion. Many unanimous votes were taken that could have been handled by informal agreement. There was a tendency to regard the observer as a parliamentarian. The proceedings of the committee in general were under the domination of one member. Only mild opposition ever appeared to his dominance. The non-contributing members were never brought into the discussion and were not solicited. The final decisions of the group were forced by the dominant members to unanimous decisions under the pressure of time.

D. Report of Observer 4.

1. A. M.

Matters of procedure occasioned some discussion at the outset and became involved in intricate parliamentary details. The observer was asked to help the group out of parliamentary difficulties in several cases. Basic goals were rather vaguely established. The greatest emphasis seemed to be on setting a procedure to be followed in consideration of the bills before the committee. A minority group began to make itself felt but did not come clearly into the open in this session. The group was somewhat formal. Only a few of the members got the feeling of working together. The rest maintained a wholly individualistic attitude toward the committee. Once procedure had been agreed upon the group followed it rather well. When variations appeared the chairman imposed a time limit for discussion of that issue. No basic controversies appeared in the discussion.

2. P. M.

Procedure for the current session was determined at the very outset of the meeting.

Spirited give-and-take of ideas took place as the group considered the specific bills handed to the committee. The size of the committee made it impossible to hear everyone on every measure, but for the most part everyone took active part at one time or another. Only one or two persons failed to make important contributions. The amount of evidence and information brought out by the committee was outstanding. A distinct eagerness to communicate became evident soon after the opening of the session. A very vocal minority group threatened at one point to split the committee but was persuaded to hold with the committee. Each bill was treated thoroughly according to the agreed upon procedure, yet the group felt that with more time they could have included more careful consideration. The group was very responsive to the feedbacks and would continue to question the observer as to methods and techniques of group operation. A very pleasant experience. Leadership in the group was very capable and held the respect of the committee. The biggest difficulty of the group was in cutting through the maze of parliamentary procedure.

E. Reports of Observer 5.

1. A. M.

At the outset the committee became embroiled in parliamentary procedure. Four members of the group dominated this matter. A large part of the session was spent in these problems. Feedback of the observer called attention to this and the problem was gradually eliminated. The group had difficulty in stating goals at first. Several sub-groups stubbornly held to their predetermined positions. Feedback at this point called attention to the danger of this, and the situation eased at once. The group was very formal at first, but under pressure from the observer in his feedback the formality gave way to an easier give-and-take. Once the group got to the point of setting goals, it established a sound, basic outline of objectives. The committee was very erratic in moving toward these goals during this session. The group felt strained toward the observer at first but soon accepted him as part of the group. There was no basic group unity until the last thirty minutes of the session. At that point the group seemed to get an insight and to move forward with a spurt. This group gave evidence of flexibility and intelligent adaptation to the situation once it got on the track.

2. P. M.

The participation during the second session was excellent. Four members seemed to dominate at various points, but this did not affect group unity because their discussion was pertinent to the problem. The group worked well as a team. A small minority group appeared, but the unity of the group held them in a cooperative activity. The atmosphere was very friendly and flexible. Excellent discussion procedure was apparent throughout this session. The feedbacks of the observer were accepted and acted upon quickly and efficiently. Evidence of the group's appreciation of the observer came with a vote of thanks for his work. (We like that very much.)

F. Report of Observer 6.

1. A. M.

The goals of the group were not clearly defined. Several varying points of view were evident. A two-man monopoly of the discussion occurred often in the form of an informal debate between two members of the group. The leader seemed to be very adept but probably a little too "laissez-faire". A digression near the end of the session occurred and was interrupted by a visiting faculty member's calling attention to a point that the group had missed. Six or seven members of the group seemed to dominate the discussion in alternating pairs. One member talked excessively and generally antagonized the group. The rest of the committee, however, tried to be very tolerant of him and to give him every opportunity to come through. He felt somewhat "squeezed out" several times as the vote went totally against him. He still persisted in opposition. A rugged individualist with little feeling for group unity.

2. P. M.

The observer opened the session with a report of the results of the questionnaires from the morning session showing encouraging responses from the group. Again too much dialogue between two members prevented complete discussion of one of the issues. The leader finally had to break up the pair by a question that brought observations from others in the group. The goals of the group became lost in considering a minor matter and in the difficulty of parliamentary procedure at that point. The antagonistic member of the morning presented a special substitute for consideration; and seeing that it would fail, began a filibuster. The observer was called in to help but placed the decision back in the hands of the group. The group voted against the obstructionist, who continued to attempt obstruction of the wishes of the majority of the group. The majority overruled him, and he went into silence for a short time but soon reappeared to propose a new and equally unpopular measure. It was almost lost without a second but finally was voted down by the group as a whole. The obstructionist again came back with a full bill of his own, and the group voted against its consideration. The observer at this point commended the group on its patience and consideration of the feelings and rights of the minority member. Finally he was given a chance to present another bill. Practical difficulties of the bill made it hard to handle, and the group began to fall apart and to withdraw from active participation while the protagonist held the floor by default.

In spite of the obstructionist in the group the committee moved efficiently and effectively for the most part. Feedbacks were excellently received. The leader did a particularly good job.

G. Report of Observer 7.

1. A. M.

Goals were established very soon after the meeting opened and were agreed upon without difficulty. The group had a tendency to "hew to the line" under the pressure of time. The procedure in this session ran smoothly and swiftly. Occasional healthy conflicts were ironed out without trouble. Three or four persons

played dominant roles with about half the group contributing freely. The group worked well as a team. One person, however, stood clearly in opposition to the program advanced by the committee, but he was not inclined to make an issue of the matter because of the predominance of votes against him. The chair wisely asked this man to act as a group "stabilizer". Some stiffness was evident, but for the most part the group was friendly and informal. The leader was quite capable and fair.

2. P. M.

During the first half of the session the committee worked with the excellent efficiency established in the morning session. Then a "bombshell exploded". The one-man opposition of the morning drew two or three others into his orbit and proceeded to obstruct further progress of the committee. This minority group resorted to filibuster and general obstructionist tactics. The group reacted hotly. Charge and counter-charge flew around the table, and unkind things were spoken. The chairman, who up to that point had kept things well in hand, was completely snowed under with the avalanche of tactical maneuvering. In spite of the favor of the majority for the bill under consideration, the obstruction of the minority stopped consideration of the measure. (NOTE: It was evident that this situation was a clear example of a "snowball" reaction. Note that in the morning the minority was quiet. The observer reported, however, on his questionnaire that this one-man minority had indicated a strong opposition to everything that was being done. A split was predicted in the closed session of the observers, and we all sat back to watch. During the early part of the afternoon the minority formed slowly and presented a small resistance to the first measure considered by the committee. Then as the last measure came up, the minority gathered its forces and went to work.)

H. Report of Observer 8.

1. A. M.

Under the dominance of the leader little seemed to be accomplished at this session. The group failed to clarify its goals and procedures. The leader tended to dictate the procedure. All members, however, contributed to the general discussion. While the atmosphere was informal, the parliamentary procedure seemed to obstruct clear thinking on the basic problems at hand. The group seemed well unified under the dominance of the leader. Very little actual work on the bills was accomplished at this session.

2. P. M.

As a result of the feedback at the close of the previous session the chairman asked the group to omit the formality of parliamentary procedure. He attempted to bring the goals into focus, but the group failed to understand and apply the suggestion. In contrast to the morning session, he was very weak in this meeting. The committee in turn did nothing but agree or disagree to the prepared bills presented to it. Extended discussion often occurred over minor working of bills, and members sought to maintain their own solutions at any cost. The result seemed to be a breakdown of the group. Often the group ceased to function as a unit and broke

up into small conversational groups all talking at the same time. Fatigue and boredom became evident, and participation became restricted to three or four persons toward the end of the meeting. Conflicts between several members would freeze out the rest of the group for extended periods of time. In general, this was an example of a dominant leader's too suddenly withdrawing his control. The result was general loss of unity and cohesion in the group.

VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

We shall let the above data speak for themselves concerning what happened in the committee sessions as seen through the eyes of the observers. We must keep in mind, however, that these observations are those of a single observer. Their validity is strengthened by the comparison with the questionnaires, but they still remain subjective.

From our experiences in this Congress with the observer technique we suggest the following conclusions:

1. That trained observers can provide a valuable assistance to the operation of committees in legislative work.
2. That in most cases where the greatest use was made of the observer as a process reporter the committee seemed to operate with increasing effectiveness.
3. That formal parliamentary procedure often inhibits clear thinking in the small committee sessions where the origin and development of legislative measures are the prime concern of the delegates.
4. That, for the most part, the members of the Congress were seriously concerned with problems at hand. In only a couple of cases was there evidence of "play acting".
5. That the members of legislative committees needed to study the methods of group procedure and discussion more thoroughly.
6. That the role of the minority in a discussion is not very well understood and that the problem of dealing with minority opinion is a serious and dangerous undertaking.
7. That the instruments used in this Congress for observing and describing the work of the committee had some value and consistency in "feeling the pulse" of the committee work.

In light of the work of the observers, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. That the observer system be used in subsequent Congresses.
2. That, when possible, a longer training period be given for the observers so that their techniques of feedback can be more effective and efficient.
3. That more adequate instruments for measuring the work of the committees be set up and tested experimentally to prove their worth.
4. That more training in group methods be given to delegates to the Congress before they are selected to attend.
5. That we continue to do everything possible to make this Congress a training ground for effective legislative work and not a weak mimicry of the faults of our local, state, and national legislatures. We believe that the use of observers and a study of our work is part of the process of reaching this objective. There is evi-

dence in this report that the Delta Sigma Rho we have done or are doing all that can be done.
 Congress is outstanding for its development of We should continue to look forward to improve-
 legislative skill. Yet we should not feel that ment.

Form No. 1
 D. S. R. Congress
 1949

Questionnaire for Members
 of the Committees

Name Date Committee

Your help by supplying this information will contribute to the improvement and evaluation of our committee meetings.

1. How did you feel this meeting was today? (Please check)

No good Mediocre Good Excellent

2. Did you find yourself wanting to say things during the meeting that you didn't actually say?

Never A few times Frequently Very Frequently

3. Were there any particular reasons why you did not contribute?
 If so, please list.

4. What do you think this group was trying to accomplish today?

5. To what extent were the things you personally hoped to get out of the meeting different from what the group was trying to accomplish?

Completely Somewhat Fairly Identical
 opposed opposed opposed

6. How fully do you think the members were in accord with what the group was trying to accomplish today?

Small minority Large Good Completely
 in accord minority Majority in accord

7. How satisfied are you with the decisions reached by this group in *this* session?

Very Satisfied Dissatisfied Very
 satisfied dissatisfied

OBSERVER'S REPORT

Observer Group

Time of Session to Topic

1. Number of observations made

- a. Requested by chairman
- b. Requested by group member
- c. Initiated by observer

2. Type of observation data reported by you.

Type	Number of times mentioned by observer	Reaction to observation (plus, minus, or 0)
------	--	--

- A. Parliamentary matters
- B. Goal processes
- C. Participation
- D. Communication
- E. Group Unity
- F. Group atmosphere
- G. Group progress toward goal
- H. Conflict situations
- I. Personnel relationships
- J. Leader functions
- K. Member roles and functions

3. Evidence of group's use of the observer's reports.

4. General structure of the group.

- A. Divided segments in conflict
- B. Group unity and cohesion
- C. Dominating sub-group
- D. Dominating member

- E. Distintegration and confusion
- F. Passivity and disinterest
- G. Indecision and stalemate
- H. Static relationships of members
- I. Variable relationship of members
- 5. Personnel
 - A. Personal antagonism apparent
 - B. Non-participating members
 - C. Faculty intervention
 - D. Social groupings (male-female, race, creed, etc.)
 - E. Evidence of fatigue
 - F. Amount of information
- 6. General summary of procedures: _____/_____/_____

Report of the Legislative Committee . . .

The Legislative Committee consisted of five students who were assigned at the beginning of the Congress the purpose of analyzing how best to improve the machinery of the Congress. After its opening instructions, the Committee was left entirely to its own direction. The Committee set up the following agenda, which was carried out during the course of the Congress:

- Thursday evening: Held the opening discussion to decide on the objectives of the Congress. Visited the party caucuses. Visited the post-caucus sessions.
- Friday morning: Met to report on the information gathered Thursday. Attended the Assembly for the election of Speaker and Clerk. Met to decide who was to attend the different committee meetings. Visited the main committee meetings.
- Friday afternoon: Visited the afternoon sessions of the committees.
- Friday evening: Distributed questionnaires at the banquet. Visited the joint conference committee meetings.
- Saturday morning: Attended the General Assembly. Met to reach conclusions and to prepare the report.

During the course of the Congress, the Committee interviewed Professors Thorrel B. Fest, Warren A. Guthrie, J. Garber Drushal, John W. Keltner, and a number of the students.

The Committee, composed entirely of students, found it necessary to adjust to the absence of faculty direction. However, once adjusted to working on its own, the group found itself operating easily. Much of this adjustment took place Thursday evening when the group found it necessary to satisfy itself as to what the objectives of the Congress were before attempting to analyze its operation. These objectives, the group concluded, were:

1. To provide for study and participation by the delegates in discussion techniques.
2. To provide for study and participation by the delegates in legislative procedures.
3. To provide opportunities for effective public speaking.
4. To provide an opportunity for an exchange of ideas among the delegates from differ-

ent parts of the country on questions of national importance.

With these goals in mind, the Legislative Committee reached agreement on a number of specific recommendations for improvement in the machinery of the Congress.

1. RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING ARRANGEMENTS:
 - A. It is unanimously recommended by this committee that future Delta Sigma Rho Congresses utilize the facilities of state legislative chambers where available. We feel that such chambers lend dignity and inspiration to student delegates and are, from the student's point of view, conducive to a higher level of accomplishment, greater feeling of responsibility, and a more realistic environment for legislative sessions.
 - B. It is recommended that a roster of experts who are available for testimony from the surrounding area be compiled for the use of the Congress in committee session.
 - C. It is recommended that an increase of one day be made in the time that Congress is in session if such a measure is practical and financially possible, and that this increase in time be apportioned to main committee meetings and joint conference meetings.
 - D. It is recommended that in order to increase the attendance of active chapters at the Congress, a system be adopted for sharing the cost in attending the Congress.
 - E. It is also recommended for future Congresses that the importance of a knowledge of Parliamentary procedure be brought forcefully to the attention of all delegates in pre-Congress literature. A representative poll taken by this committee during the Congress has indicated that over one-half of the participating delegates have had insufficient preparation on this matter. By having all delegates well acquainted with the Parliamentary rules of procedure, time spent on the acquisition of such information at this Congress could be more profitably
- (Continued on bottom of Page 77)