

BRAINSTORMING

Henry Syjueco
Bob Racelis
Neal Tieng

De La Salle University

Problems were presented for brainstorming to 36 Genpsyc students of De La Salle University. Within a counter-balanced experimental design, each subject brainstormed on a particular problem individually and on the next problem as a member of a 3-man team. The individual condition were more productive than the group condition. Apparently, group participation has some inhibitory influence which put it as an disadvantage over the individual treatment condition. The superiority of the individual condition is shown by the fact that 11 out of 12 groups produced a large of different ideas under the individual condition. To further strengthen our assumption, we used the T-test for correlated samples and obtained 2.647 which is greater than the T-critical of 2.0315 to conclude that individual condition is significantly more productive than group condition. Contrary to the brainstorming assumption of greater stimulation and productivity in group situation, it is expected on the basis of previous research that more unusual uses are produced when the subjects work as individuals than when they work as groups.

Initial research on brainstorming as an eliciting or problem solving technique, emphasize the value of group participation as a facilitating factor in producing good ideas . For examples, Osborn(1957) concludes that on the basis of experiments conducted, "the average person can think up twice as many ideas when working with a group than when working alone" He adds that a combination of group and individual effort is best but fails to specify the exact nature of the optimal combination. Two initial researches regarding brainstorming were conducted by Parnes and Meadows in 1959 and by Dunnette, Campbell & Jaastad



COGNITIVE
PSYCHOLOGY
LABORATORY

AKLATANG ENRIQUE AGUIRREDO ARCHIVES

in 1963 and has conflicting results. On the study conducted by Dunnette, Campbell, & Jaastad (1963) on the effect of group participation on brainstorming effectiveness, they concluded that individuals produced far more ideas than groups and accomplished these without sacrificing quality. They also found out that the superiority of individual brainstorming over group brainstorming was positively and relatively greater when it was preceded by group participation. Dunnette et al partially modified the design of a particular experiment by Taylor et. al. Their purpose was to repeat the Taylor et. al. study among two (2) different occupational groups. They modified the design of the Taylor study in order to allow subjects to participate in both individual and group brainstorming sessions.

Dunnette et. al. employed 48 research personnel and 48 persons employed in an advertising department. Each of the two sets of subjects were divided into 12 groups of 4 men each. They allowed their subjects to participate in both the individual and group conditions and the problem sets in order of participation were counterbalanced. The problems used in the study were the same as those used by Taylor et. al. only with the addition of a 4th problem.

Our purpose has been to repeat the Dunnette et. al. study among students of De La Salle University. The reason for this study is to strengthen our belief in comparison with that of Dunnette et. al. that individual brainstorming produced more creative ideas than group brainstorming. We allowed our subjects to participate in both individual and group brainstorming. Our

independent variable is that of working condition (as a group or individual) and our dependent variable is that of creativity. Working condition as divided into group and individual brainstorming. In group condition, subjects are allowed to interact freely with their groupmates. However, in order to prevent duplicate listing of ideas they produced themselves. In individual condition, the subjects are to work separately or individually of their previous groupmates. The ideas that were asked to them consist of unusual uses of a particular problem given.

METHOD

In order to test the hypothesis, 36 De La Salle University Genpsyc undergraduate students were utilized as subjects. Subjects were gathered through the use of a poster in the cognitive psychology laboratory. Genpsyc subjects were acquired by offering 2½ hour credit which would give the students enough so the subjects would be active throughout the experiment. None of these subjects had undergone any previous experience in this kind of experiment. 36 subjects were divided into 12 3 person teams each working on 2 different creativity problem. For each problem the subjects are given theme of a common object and then instructed to think of as many unusual uses for the object as possible. In one experimental condition, the 3 subjects are instructed to work as a group. In the other experimental condition, the same subjects are instructed to work inde