

Peer evaluation essay example

[Sociology](#), [Communication](#)



Communication: Peer Evaluation

[Author Name(s), First M. Last, Omit Titles and Degrees]

[Institutional Affiliation(s)]

[Include any grant/funding information and a complete correspondence address.]

Abstract

Groupthink is a bane of modern decision-making teams. Such groups prefer to arrive at a consensus rather than thinking out of the box. There are several strategies that can be used to avoid group thinking and arrive at a high quality decision.

Keywords: Groupthink, decision-making, decision

Communication: Peer Evaluation

As in all groups that believe in getting along and making decisions without stepping on others' toes, my group is as prone to the ills of groupthink as any other. From past experience I am aware that my group functions this way when faced with decision-making. In anticipation of a groupthink decision, I will constantly be monitoring and mitigating every instance of emerging groupthink. Firstly, I would try to limit the size of the group to less than 10 members, who are selected because of certain criteria. Larger groups might cause the decision making process to gravitate towards arriving at a consensus, all for the wrong reasons(Janis, 1971). Secondly, I would try to include experts/consultants in the decision-making process at each step of the process, to incorporate external view points into the group's thinking processes and ultimate plans. Thirdly, I would try to avoid rushing to

make a decision without adequately discussing and vetting issues involved in peer performance evaluation. I might utilize the parallel thinking process that helps my group members to separate their thinking into six clear functions/roles (De Bono, 2003) like using the “white hat” symbolically to call for all the information available or needed to make a decision. Thus the group would be encouraged to invest their time constructively in structured discussions before arriving at a decision. Fourthly, I would urge the group to develop a second decision, in case policy makers reject our first decision on peer performance evaluation. The group would be trained to have sufficient evidence in hand to defend their decision. Fifth, I would play the role of the devil’s advocate in the group, where for every pro the group comes up with, I would come up with a con. This would enable my group to debate each and every decision of theirs’ rationally. The old adage says, “prevention is better than cure”; thus, by being prepared for groupthink would enable our group to arrive at a high quality beneficial decision on peer performance evaluation.

References

De Bono, E. (2003). Six Thinking Hats. Six Thinking Hats - Business

Summaries, 1-5. doi: 10.1590/S0034-75901988000100011

Janis, I. (1971). Groupthink. *Psychology today* (pp. 43-46, 74-76.). Retrieved from <http://apps.olin.wustl.edu/faculty/macdonald/GroupThink.pdf>