

Angry men analysis



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

In the beginning of the movie, Jury number 1 seems to be an "emergent leader" (An emergent leader gradually achieves leadership by interacting with group members and contributing to the achievement of the group's goal, page 113). From the start he has started folding papers for voting, and the other Jurors seem to follow him. When he said we would like to get started, they all gather on the table. The type of leadership he is showing is "democratic" (a democratic leader promotes the interests of group members and practices social equality, page 117).

He asks for input from the other Jurors on how they should do the discussion. Pretty much he is the one controlling the flow of the discussion. He is also an "initiator" (Proposes ideas and suggestions; provides direction for the group; gets the group started, page 58). When the group just came back from break he said, "Now let's get started. Who wants to start it off?" However, during the movie Henry Fonda seems to start taking over gradually by leading the group of "not guilty". He looks more like the emergent leader towards the end of the movie.

During the discussion, some of the Jurors are acting as "deserter" (Withdraws from the group; appears "above it all" and bored or annoyed with the discussion; remains aloof or stops contributing, page 61) by playing games, left the room, even the group leader (Juror no. 8) was about to desert the group because he feels that the group thinks that his way of doing things is not right. The juror that wants to leave the discussion because he wants to watch a game almost "deserts" the discussion by changing his vote to "not guilty" so that the discussion would end earlier.

Toward the middle of the discussion, one of the Jurors was taking notes and trying to build up a solid fact from the discussion while the other Jurors are talking. He was doing an "analytical listening", which focuses on evaluating and forming appropriate opinions about a message. It requires critical thinking and analysis (page 193). The climate changes moderately throughout the film. It starts off with a good climate, then it gets tighter when the Jurors start arguing until even some of them feels that the other is being insensitive. Nonverbal communications" (message components other than words that generate meaning, page 163) that were shown in the discussion are for example, Jurors playing games while the others are talking, throwing papers, etc. As for verbal communication (focuses on how you use words and language, page 163), there are changes in vocal tone by the Jurors that were aggravated by some other Jurors that changed their mind to "not guilty". The Conflict starting at the beginning of the movie when the jurors were trying to answer the question, "Is the suspect guilty?".

Henry Fonda decided to go against the other 11 Jurors by voting "not guilty" for the suspect. This raised a "substantive conflict" (Occurs when a member disagrees about issues, ideas, decisions, actions or goals", page 211). The group does not like that decision, so the goal cannot be reached. Henry Fonda was very strong in his vote, so then emerged "hidden agenda" (A hidden agenda occurs when a member's private goal conflicts with the group's goals, page 38) from the group to try to convince Henry to change his vote because some of them want to go home, and the other thinks that it is too obvious and sticks to their decisions.

Henry's conflict style is "compromise conflict style" (a middle ground approach that involves conceding some goals in order to achieve others, page 218), this works well because if you use compromise conflict Tyler, you are not saying that the other person is wrong, but saying that he has a point, but there is more to it. In the movie when somebody says "the kid ran away because he is afraid to get caught", he would reply with "let's say the kid really ran away ... Then he would say his reasoning. In the middle of the movie, there was a "procedural conflict" (disagreement among group members about the method or process the group uses in its attempt to accomplish a goal, page 212). When a Juror suggested for another vote, one other Juror wanted an open ballot instead of a vote. Toward the middle of the discussion, there are basically two groups that were formed in there, which are the "guilty" group and the "not guilty" group.

The "not guilty" group reached "performing stage", where all members are fully engaged and eager to work (page 32). They all work together to try to put all the evidence together to see exactly if the testimonies from witnesses are true. Juror no. 3 (the one that said "not guilty" the last) is very "aggressive" (acts in their own self-interest at the expense of others. They are critical, insensitive, combative, and even abusive, page 68). He hoots most of the time, and even gets angry to some of the other Jurors.

His conflict style looks like a "competition conflict style" (group members are more concerned with their own goals than the group", page 217), because I feel like his pride is a bit in the way of him choosing "not guilty". The Juror that has a cold in the beginning of the movie is has "prejudice" (negative attitudes about other people that are based on faulty and inflexible

stereotypes. Prejudices about an individual or culture group often arise when we have little or no direct experience with that person, page 81) award people who grew in slums.

He said that he knows everything about those who grows in slums, that they are aggressive, and does not even speak good English. He mentioned those even without knowing the person he is talking about. During the discussion, some of the members wanted votes to see how they are doing so far. This expresses a "sense of progress". It is difficult for members to stay motivated throughout the life of the group when they have no idea whether the group is making progress toward its goal (page 147). One of the Jurors even asked for an open ballot to see who is still voting for "not guilty".