COMS 361 – BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION

FALL SEMESTER, 2020

STUDY GUIDE FOR UNIT 3: Cooperating (Group COMS)

Material from the reading by Jehn

- 1. Know whether or not, in much of the previous literature, conflict is generally deemed detrimental to performance and satisfaction. Know whether or not, while most studies use observational and unobtrusive methods, the author uses survey methods, or the other way around. Know whether or not conflict theory and research has primarily focused on disagreements about ends, but conflict can just as easily occur about means. Know whether or not, in many organizational groups, group members largely agree about individual and group goals yet they still find themselves in conflict. Know whether or not task-related management team conflict can improve organizational performance and growth through enhanced understanding of various viewpoints and creative options. Know whether or not Guetzkow and Gyr proposed that both "affective" and "substantive" conflicts exist. Know whether or not empirical research shows a positive association between relationship conflict, productivity, and satisfaction in groups. Know whether or not task conflict can improve decision-making outcomes and group productivity by increasing decision quality through incorporating devil's advocacy roles and constructive criticism. Know whether or not emotions define individuals' subjective interpretation of reality and reactions to current situations. Know whether or not there has been considerable evidence of positive effects of relationship conflict on both performance and satisfaction. (p. 530-533)
- Know whether or not all interviews were carried out in private at the informant's workplace but were not audiorecorded. Know whether or not the author used the tree diagrams to investigate the group members' cognitive schemas surrounding loyalty. Know whether or not the distinction between two types of conflict is apparent in all but one of the tree diagram examples. Know whether or not the data revealed a type of conflict labeled "process conflict." Know whether or not the author examined the similarity of trees across work unit members by comparing the terms in each tree diagram and its placement in the tree. Know whether or not the author asked informants questions in follow-up interviews to check the reliability of the categorizations in their tree diagrams and the consistency with answers provided in the focused interviews. Know whether or not, while it is easy to imagine the emotional component in relationship conflict, task and process conflicts can also contain high levels of emotion. Know whether or not a term placed at the top of the tree was considered a secondary category placement, which indicates comprehensiveness, importance, and saliency of the term or category in an individual's memory. Know whether or not the acceptability dimension refers to group norms about conflict and communication. Know whether or not low-performing groups had higher levels of relationship conflict than high performing groups. Know whether or not, despite the negative effects of process conflict, changes in job assignments and responsibilities were sometimes necessary and even boosted group productivity. Know whether or not the perceived resolution potential of a conflict had a general, positive effect on performance and satisfaction. Know whether or not the International and the Foreign Coding units were the lowest performing groups in the set and had moderate to high levels of taskrelated conflict. Know whether or not, in the Communication Unit, members work interdependently to complete all communication-related tasks for the international division of the firm. Know whether or not the second round of interviews occurred simultaneously with the observation and were semi-focused, with questions about specific topics and research questions. (p. 533-551)
- 3. Know whether or not **two of the three types** of conflict were perceived as **distinct and distinguishable** by group members. Know whether or not **process conflict** appeared to have a **direct negative relationship** with group performance. Know whether or not **past research** has suggested a **curvilinear relationship** between **task conflict and performance**, such that low levels of task conflict **inhibit performance**, moderate levels enhance performance, and **high levels decrease performance**. Know whether or not the current data suggest that the **optimal profile** for high-performing groups includes important, **moderate task conflicts**, no **relationship conflicts**, little or no **procedural conflict**, with norms that task conflict is **acceptable and resolvable** and with little negative emotionality. Know whether or not past research often focused on conflict that **arises** over the **specific ends** of the group rather than examining conflict about the means by which those ends **were reached**. Know whether or not **specific norms** exist for **each type of conflict** within groups. (p. 551-552)
- 4. Know whether or not the **multiple methods** of this study provide data that support a **grounded theory** of multidimensional intragroup conflict. Know whether or not the data reveal that organizational members have **relationship**, **process**, and **task-related conflicts** that can be **highly emotional**, can have little potential for **quick**

resolution, and can be **very important** to the group's members. Know whether or not **destructive conflict**, fueled by **interpersonal difficulties**, process **uncertainty**, and **negative emotion** can undermine the potential **benefits** of group interaction. Know whether or not **task conflicts** focus on interpersonal relationships, while **relationship conflicts** focus on the content and the goals of the work. Know whether or not the dimensions uncovered (**emotionality**, **importance**, **acceptability**, **resolution potential**) were related to all three types of conflict. (p. 552-554)

Material from the reading by Klocke

- 1. Know whether or not groups can produce a **better outcome** by exchanging the **unshared information** of each group member and making the decision on the **basis of all information** (**shared** and **initially unshared**). Know whether or not, **in comparable interventions** of previous studies, group members often only received **information passively**. Know whether or not, in the **interventions** in the study, group members were also **actively engaged** in a group exercise aimed at demonstrating the **effectiveness or ineffectiveness** of specific processes. Know whether or not, whereas this study focused either on **processes at the group level** or on **processes at the individual level**, previous studies analyzes **both levels simultaneously**. Know whether or not, in a **hidden profile task**, groups often do not go beyond a **simple aggregation** of their initial preferences. (p. 437-438)
- 2. Know whether or not Brownstein found that people bias their information processing to favor an initially preferred alternative. Know whether or not, the higher the amount of relevant information that groups process, the lower the quality of their decisions. Know whether or not, in the study by Schulz-Hardt, there is evidence at the group level that more systematic processing of information results in higher quality decisions. Know whether or not the proportion of group members who have specific information before discussion is related to the impact of this information on the subsequent group decision. Know whether or not groups might fail to process the available information systematically. Know whether or not, in hidden profile tasks, only the integration of unshared information ensures higher quality decisions by groups compared to individuals. Know whether or not unshared information, even if mentioned in the discussion, is seriously considered by other group members and therefore has more impact on the final decision than shared information. Know whether or not some studies have shown that decision quality is unrelated to the introduction of shared information. Know whether or not systematic processing and both biases only occur at the group level. Know whether or not Tasa and Whyte found a positive relationship between vigilant problem solving and group performance. (p. 438-442)
- Know whether or not there is evidence at the group level and at the individual level that dissent can have 3. promotional effects on decision making. Know whether or not, if the group members recognize divergent preferences of other members, they might be more prone to an early direct expression of their own preference than if they agree with the other members. Know whether or not it is likely that the positive effect of dissent on group decision quality is **mediated** by more systematic and less biased processing at the **individual level**. Know whether or not it has been demonstrated that dissent, especially when articulated by a consistent minority, promotes divergent thinking, a variable related to unbiased processing. Know whether or not researchers have found evidence that groupthink can have detrimental effects on group decisions. Know whether or not a lot of interventions have not been successful in enhancing group decision quality. Know whether or not both interventions were aimed at enhancing systematic processing. Know whether or not the mixed results of previous interventions suggest that a mere instruction to participants to prevent defective processes is not always enough to improve quality of group decisions. Know whether or not, in the reported study, it was assumed that the sharedness intervention would increase the **sharedness bias**. Know whether or not some authors instructed group members to **avoid mentioning** their preferences in the first part of the discussion and concentrate instead on recalling and pooling all relevant information. (p. 442-445)
- 4. Know whether or not all variables except decision quality were normally distributed. Know whether or not the motive for sharedness bias and the preference bias in information evaluation correlated positively with decision quality. Know whether or not, in line with Hypothesis 4, Hypothesis 10, and Hypothesis 11, in the ANCOVA, significant effects emerged. Know whether or not the manipulation of the initial preference for a certain candidate was successful for 88% of the participants. Know whether or not, on average, participants agreed on the items measuring the motive for sharedness bias to a medium extent. Know whether or not an interesting finding is that dissent had opposite effects on the preference bias at the individual level and at the group level. Know whether or not Schulz-Hardt et al. found that dissent reduced the repetition bias in favor of preference-consistent information. Know whether or not neither intervention was successful in stimulating systematic processing at the group level. Know whether or not, because of time restrictions for the experimental sessions, the evaluation of information was not measured separately for each piece of information. Know whether or not this study analyzed both biases and systematic processing at the group level and at the individual level. (p. 453-464)
- Know whether or not decision making in the context of complex problems rarely requires the integration of knowledge from different experts. Know whether or not, as no intervention alone was able to enhance group decision quality, a

combination of both **interventions and a stronger focus** on individual-level processes is **recommended**. Know whether or not the individual **overvaluing of shared and preference-consistent information** is responsible for the **failure to identify** the correct decision in the group. Know whether or not, when decision quality is of **high importance**, the decision-making team should be composed of members with a **diversity of opinions**. Know whether or not, if **no dissent** is present, evaluation bias can also be reduced by **two training interventions** with a **group exercise** to demonstrate defective decision processes. (p. 465)

Material from the reading by Warketin et al.

- 1. Know whether or not virtual teams that can fulfil constantly changing task requirements can offer organizations the flexibility to remain competitive. Know whether or not synchronous meetings require more time than asynchronous meetings because information exchange takes longer, or the other way around. Know whether or not virtual teams are groups of people engaged in a common task or goal communicating through electronic means, which may be electronic mail (email), Web-based communications, video and/or audio, but in general having considerable interaction on-line. Know whether or not CMCS increase the range, capacity and speed of managerial communications. Know whether or not asynchronous meetings are spontaneous, in which ideas are exchanged with little structure. Know whether or not developing relational links involves performing activities related to the member support and group well-being functioning. Know whether or not the development of relational links among team members has been found to be a significant contributor to the effectiveness of information exchange. Know whether or not the the exchange of social information will help teams develop relational links. Know whether or not face-to-face conversation is a remarkably disorderly process. Know whether or not nonverbal mode includes tone of voice, inflection, and voice volume. (p. 271-273)
- 2. Know whether or not electronic communication has benefits and drawbacks that have often been referred to as "process gains and losses." Know whether or not it has been shown that higher total levels of information exchange within groups is associated with improved outcomes and that information exchange is strongly affected by the group's internal dynamics or relational links. Know whether or not it has been found that electronic communication channels initially raise relational intimacy. Know whether or not a critical part of any meeting is the development of a relationship among the participants to provide a foundation for trust and commitment. Know whether or not media richness theory and social presence theory state that computer-mediated group interactions are lacking in their ability to share socioemotional information and cues needed to develop trust, warmth and other interpersonal affections. Know whether or not the participants in this study were upper-level undergraduate students enrolled in a course on computer architecture. Know whether or not the three virtual team tasks were part of the required work for the course. Know whether or not participants were informed of possible drawbacks to electronic communication. Know whether or not MeetingWeb was designed to have a familiar look and feel to users of the World Wide Web. Know whether or not subjects were administratively placed into 12 groups in such a way that no two members who met face-to-face in other course projects would be virtual partners. (p. 273-281)
- Know whether or not VTC training led to increasing perceptions of cohesiveness and satisfaction with process over time. Know whether or not, although not statistically significant, teams with VTC training out-performed the control teams on the assigned tasks, and anecdotally reported higher levels of satisfaction with the dynamics of group interaction. Know whether or not many business teams meet only in the virtual space. Know whether or not many researchers have found that, between women and men, there are measurable conversational differences in the patterns and uses of interaction primitives such as verbosity, interruption/turn-taking, tag questions and directives. Know whether or not Chidambaram and Bostrom developed a framework that classifies all models of group development into two broad categories: sequential and non-sequential. Know whether or not many respondents indicated that the lags and delays of asynchronous communications constrained their communications, making it inefficient and impeding the formation of group consensus and conclusions. Know whether or not any of the individual responses to the qualitative open-ended questions on the research instrument proved to be informative. Know whether or not analysis of the data indicates that the teams **not receiving** the VTC training started out with **fairly** high evaluations in terms of the three relational variables, but these measurements steadily decreased throughout the project. Know whether or not non-sequential models do not propose a predetermined sequence of events but focus on explaining the underlying factors that cause shifts in group development. Know whether or not members of both the treatment and the control groups had significant objections to engaging in groups without the benefit of traditional face-to-face interaction dynamics. Know whether or not there was a temporal trend, and participants were able to identify characteristics by the mid-study survey and these perceptions were significantly different at the end of the study. Know whether or not trust is a basic feature of social situations that require cooperation and interdependence and also plays a critical role in problem solving. Know whether or not the group sizes for each section (18 with VTC training and 20 for non-VTC training) were large enough to offer rigorous statistical analysis. Know whether or not the findings from the analysis of the trust, common goals and openness variables suggest that it may be worthwhile to investigate further these relationships. Know whether or not it would be informative to evaluate teams that communicate virtually initially and then proceed to work face-to-face. (p. 281-287)