

# Essay on discover group communication characteristics

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



. Wiki Discussion

With regard to the task and maintenance roles in our group Amanda Louise Cagle was an initiator and encourager because she initiated our work and then gave positive assessment to everyone for what he or she had contributed into the project. Natalie Nicole Faulk and I acted like information seekers. Later on I performed as elaborator. Barry Michael Aldridge was an elaborator and information giver in our team. Nathan James Dill mostly acted like a follower and sometimes as an information giver (Trenholm, 2008). Our work was developed in accordance with Tuckman's Five-Stage Model. We successfully overcame primary tension and avoided secondary tension described in the Fisher's Four-Phase Model. There were several reasons why we avoided secondary tension: our personalities, short time for completing the task, lack of close cooperation and missing people who would assume negative role in our group (Trenholm, 2008).

**None of us had hidden agenda or perhaps an individual agenda coincide with the group's one in both cases.**

It seems that we achieved a balance between cohesiveness and confidence in our group. However, the lack of positive criticism could mislead us. The lack of criticism may lead to groupthink because the members of the group could not adequately evaluate the results of their work.

Amanda took an initiative that indicated her leadership abilities. She encouraged us to finish the work we began while others were waiting for someone to take on the responsibility.

Accordingly to Trenholm (2008) there are certain advantages and disadvantages of the communication in virtual groups. The researcher

argued that virtual groups are more effective when brainstorming but are worse than face-to-face communication when it comes to negotiation or problem solving. In our group we discussed everything online while it would be better to brainstorm online and then get together to discuss the alternatives and develop an effective working plan. At the same time, we saved a lot of time as everyone was busy those days. This is how the effect of computer mediation can be described. As a result everyone was satisfied with the results of our work. However, we did not get any outer reflection. Thus, it was impossible to evaluate the results of the work.

The forming stage when everyone tried to identify the relationships to each other and the complexity of the task was reflected in our wiki discussion (Trenholm, 2008).

### **More people took part in the wiki discussion thus making a good team of five members.**

Internet communication, especially in IM messenger, is informal and oversimplified. The language used during the Internet communication is primitive and is characterized by the lack of punctuation, capitalization, and slang utilization. Online chatting is characterized by exchanging short messages while e-mail correspondence extends to long sentences and paragraphs. Online conversations give the possibility to talk for nothing online and distract from the case instead of taking actions and concentrating on the project (Shedletskiy & Aitken, 2004).

#### 2. E-Mail Tip Sheet Discussion

In accordance with Trenholm (2008) a problem-solving group may consist of 5-7 people to produce an effective decision making. The group analyzed

<https://assignbuster.com/essay-on-discover-group-communication-characteristics/>

consisted of five people with three most active. The group was not effective since not all members equally contributed into the project and participated in the discussion.

Social loafing occurred when 3 members were working and others did not participate. This often happens when team members receive additive tasks and the productivity of the group is defined by adding up the efforts. The output must be proportional to achieve an effective team work. It is necessary to set individual goals and identify individual contributions. It was not done by the members of this group.

Sometimes the conversation looked like three leaders completed the assignment one by one because communication was difficult to implement. Other members of the group were comfortable leaving things as they were during e-mail tip sheet discussion.

Socialization in the group eliminated borders between group and individual thinking. To release relevant material and exploit more fully the potential of our group we needed quality brainstorming, exchange ideas and thoughts. Unfortunately, none of us expressed any positive critical thoughts in this discussion.

The Internet communication is characterized by the lack of nonverbal reaction. I think that in our case this reflection could help us better understand each other and work out better communication policy (Shedletskiy & Aitken, 2004).

We had to organize our communication so we could clearly understand who was accountable for completing definite parts of the project. As we did not do this, some of the members of our group had the possibility to social

loafing.

Our e-mail tip sheet discussion seems to be more productive than our wiki discussion. However, it was mixed with personal information which was not relevant to the case. I think that this is normal because we all are human and distraction from the case is sometimes useful. E-mail tip sheet discussion showed more detailed information because it reflected another stage of our work.

E-mail tip sheet discussion consisted of only three members who contributed more than other members into the working process. Other people were waiting for suggestions shown up as followers. We would definitely work more effective if we equally divide the task between all of the five group members. In whole our group discussion was effective because we achieved final result.

Shedletsky, L., & Aitken, J. E. (2004). Human communication on the Internet. (1st ed.) New York: Alyn & Bacon.

Trenholm, S. (2008). Thinking through communication: an introduction to the study of human communication. (5th ed.) New York: Alyn & Bacon.