

May 2008

Do You Think Your Group Thinks?

Karisa G. Guetterman

Liberty University, kguetterman@liberty.edu

Monica B. Paladini

Liberty University, mbpaladini@liberty.edu

Courtney E. Hunt

Liberty University, cehunt@liberty.edu

Heath M. Hudnall

Liberty University, hmhudnall@liberty.edu

Andres Claudio

Liberty University, axclaudio@liberty.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/coms_stud_pres

Recommended Citation

Guetterman, Karisa G.; Paladini, Monica B.; Hunt, Courtney E.; Hudnall, Heath M.; and Claudio, Andres, "Do You Think Your Group Thinks?" (2008). *Student Papers and Presentations*. Paper 1.

http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/coms_stud_pres/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Communication Studies at DigitalCommons@Liberty University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Papers and Presentations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Liberty University. For more information, please contact scholarlycommunication@liberty.edu.

“Do You Think Your Group Thinks?”:

An Examination of the Relationship between Groupthink and Small Group Type

Andres Claudio, Karisa Guetterman

Heath Hudnall, Courtney Hunt,

Monica Paladini

Dr. Faith Mullen

COMS 330-001

29 October 2007

INTRODUCTION: Heath Hudnall

From the beginning of a person's life until the last breath they take, each individual on this planet relies on, takes part in, and seeks out groups. Groups such as families, circles of friends, groups of co-workers, and support groups define how a person lives their life. Groups help people to find acceptance, to find purpose, and to make decisions in everyday life.

A small group is "a collection of at least three and ordinarily fewer than 20 individuals who are interdependent, influence one another over some period of time, share a common goal or purpose, assume specialized roles, have a sense of mutual belonging, maintain norms and standards for group membership, and engage in interactive communication." Small groups exist because people need them to. They serve to provide a way to find others who agree or have common goals. They help to satisfy the need for acceptance and belonging, as well as give the appropriate amount of social interaction necessary for living. In short, groups are what make life run smoothly. Unfortunately, nothing is perfect.

Sometimes groups can have several negative qualities. Disagreement, fighting, bitterness, and anger can all come from either not having the right group or from not working well within a group. Sometimes groups are forced together by work or school or other circumstances; the members didn't choose to be in the group. This can lead to resentment and tension between group members. Most groups aren't like this though. In fact, some groups have such high amounts of commitment and loyalty to one another, or cohesiveness, that they work together seemingly effortlessly and seamlessly. Their

decisions are made swiftly, implemented quickly, and results are found promptly. While this sounds like a wonderful group, the truth behind the amount of cohesiveness could be a very bad thing. It could be groupthink.

Groupthink is defined as “a strong concurrence-seeking tendency among members within a group that leads to a deterioration in the decision making process.” Groups whose cohesiveness is seemingly too good to be true often times find that the desire to make agreeable decisions and to not cause controversy will hinder the group's ability to make solid decisions and make actions that truly represent the best for all involved in the group. The group may have a strong leader or a lack of a solid balanced system for decision making, which in turn leads the group to believe that the decision is right and unquestionable. Members will be scared to voice their true opinions or thoughts because the rest of the group may disagree. Other groups can be seen as being lower or worse off because of a seemingly lower amount of cohesiveness, leading to arrogance in the group. All in all, no one will be checking the group to make sure decisions are being made and evaluated heavily before being implemented.

With there being so many different types of groups, groupthink can take on several forms. In families it may stem from an overbearing father. In work group on the job it may be that too many members of the group are passive and unwilling to stand up for their own opinions. In therapy groups members may believe they are completely unable to make the decision, so instead they will listen and obey the counselor. While different, the symptoms are all the same. There will be an illusion of invulnerability; the group will believe they can do no wrong. The group will have unquestioned morality, believing they have all the right answers. Pressure will be put on those who would try to disagree,

whether within the group or from the outside. Members will censor their opinions and comments as to not upset the balance or leadership. This will all cause an illusion of unanimity, as all the members will then believe they've come to a common conclusion. For different groups though, the amount of each symptom may vary.

There are six different main types of groups. First is the primary group, which consists of families and other life-long relationships that shape everyone as they grow up. Social groups are usually the second to form in life. These groups have friends and extended family relatives, and even various teams or activities in an area that people take part in to fill their need for companionship and acceptance. Educational/therapeutic groups are those formed for the purpose of helping people better understanding either their world or themselves. Another type of group is the decision-making/problem-solving group. This group comes together solely for the purpose of effectively dealing with various issues and solving problems, and usually disband promptly after the decision is made. Work groups are formed to manage organizations or complete special projects within a workplace. Lastly, mediated communications groups are a special type of small group that is made up of members from several other small groups to coordinate opportunities and share information.

Groupthink affects all groups if the members are not careful enough to make note of how it can be prevented.

LITERATURE REVIEW: Monica Paladini

The United States of America was formed in 1776. In the few centuries to follow, it has already become a super power among the nations. As a fairly young country, one may speculate that some of this success can be attributed to fresh thought and new ideas discovered by Americas overcoming new and foreign concepts.

Carl Mann outlines the progression of American decision making trends in his article “How to Remove Groupthink from Executive Decision-Making”. He begins with Alfred P. Sloan’s organizational study in the 1920s, which was adopted by General Motors. Sloan’s plan had revolutionized corporate business by the 1950s and experienced continued success well into the 1960s. His plan was an effort to ensure supply and demand but also keep a socially responsible division of power and wealth. To do this he suggested a system of decision making which became a model for corporations. His model was to distribute the decision making power among a small group of individuals at the head of the company. This provided the company with “decentralized operations and centralized control, and personal initiative and management by committee”. (Mann 1986)

By the mid 1970s Sloan’s system began to break down. The management groups had become stuck in their success of the previous 50 years and ceased to change with the times. The management teams had become isolated to themselves and their decision-making ability had declined due to “uncritical conformity”. (Mann 1986)

Within this timeframe the United States also experienced several large-scale political catastrophes. These included the unexpected attack on Pearl Harbor, the Korean War, the Bay of Pigs Invasion and the Vietnam War. A study of these incidents shows

that many of the crucial moments in these situations were influenced by poor choices made by high up government officials.

Take for example the Bay of Pigs Invasion. In hindsight we can see the fatal flaws that led president John F. Kennedy to invade Cuba in hopes of sparking a revolution. Many of the details of these decisions were not made public until 1998, but even preliminary research showed that the method of decision-making had handicapped the administration. When the audit was released in 1998 it concluded that the Central Intelligence Agency had done very little reliable research on the conditions in Cuba. Despite this, “the agency assured Kennedy that an invasion would be met with strong support from the Cuban people” (“Bay” 1997). This support did not come and the effort was a failure.

Why did this group and so many other small groups in powerful positions show such poor patterns in the corporate and political world? This heightened trend, beginning in the 1920s, prompted much research into group decision making.

In 1957, John Keltner published an explanation for this question in *Today's Speech*. Within his article he borrows the term “groupthink” from the author of a book, W. H. Whyte Jr. This is the earliest record of the term used to describe this phenomenon. He explained that thinking and discussion within groups is inescapable, but conditions of the group affect the nature of the thoughts. He wrote that a good decision requires group members to have information about the problem, the ability to organize this information and assimilate new information, an ability to identify relevant information, an ability to make reasoned judgments, an ability to think creatively, and an ability to share our

thinking during and after its occurrence. He concludes by saying that if discussion is conducted within these criteria, it will promote strong solutions.

In 1972, Irving L. Janis studied the political disasters mentioned earlier and developed “groupthink theory”. According to *Communication Theories for Everyday Life*, Janis defined groupthink as “a mode of thinking that people engage in when they are deeply involved in a cohesive in-group, when the members’ strivings for unanimity override their motivation to realistically appraise alternative courses of action” (Baldwin, Perry, and Moffit 2004). In other words, highly cohesive groups tend to be less critical and careful in their decision making in an effort to maintain peace within the group. Janis outlined eight symptoms of groupthink. According to his theory, the likelihood of groupthink increases with the emergence of the symptoms within the group, but it is unclear whether these symptoms are causes or merely indicators of groupthink (Baldwin, Perry, and Moffit 2004). The symptoms are the illusion of invulnerability, unquestioned morality, collective rationalization, stereotyping opponents negatively, self-censorship, direct pressure on dissenters, mindguards and an illusion of unanimity.

After publishing Janis’s theory in his book *Victims of Groupthink* in 1972, scholars have been studying groupthink. Research has been conducted to test the theory on past historic events and more recently to use the theory to predict group outcomes.

One of the first studies on groupthink was testing the theory itself in a controlled environment. John A. Courtright attempted to produce groupthink in groups in a laboratory. He grouped volunteers into groups according to compatibility determined by surveys. Some groups were designed to be cohesive and some were designed not to be. He gave each group the same problem to solve and taped their discussions. When the

time was up, he analyzed the decisions made and also the written transcripts of their conversations. The result was that the conversations in the incompatible groups were more negative and resulted in better decisions. The opposite was true for the highly cohesive groups. (Courtright 1978)

This study produced three results. First of all it confirmed Janis's theory of groupthink. Courtright also said that the absence of disagreement is the most important manifestation of groupthink syndrome. The indirect result of the study is that it proved groupthink could be simulated and studied in a controlled laboratory environment. (Courtright 1978)

In 1990, Rebecca J. Welch Cline used Courtright's laboratory method for studying groupthink. She begins by explaining that although several other studies had been done on groupthink since then, none of them observed the symptoms of groupthink. Cline chose to study the illusion of unanimity, only one symptom, as an antecedent condition to groupthink. (Cline 1990)

Using the same method for establishing cohesive groups in a lab, Cline gave each group a problem to solve. The results showed that in an attempt to maintain harmony, the groups designed with groupthink expressed less disagreement, than groups who did not. The agreement they expressed was mostly reiteration of previous agreements, interjections of simple agreements as interruptions, and active solicitation of agreement. Groups who did not experience groupthink were less likely to agree and more likely to substantiate what they did say. (Cline 1990)

Cline's overall conclusion supported Janis's diagnosis of the illusion of unanimity as a symptom of groupthink. It also substantiated her hypothesis that if a group

experienced an illusion of unanimity it would be more likely to experience groupthink.

(Cline 1990)

LITERATURE REVIEW (CONT.): Courtney Hunt

Given these supports of Janis' theory in the laboratory, an investigation was conducted of various studies done in uncontrolled settings. Specifically, the impact of group leadership, group norms, argumentativeness and verbal aggression, gender, and group members on groupthink were examined.

“Groupthink: Deciding with the Leader and the Devil” is a doctorate dissertation by Zenglo Chen (1996) that discusses the effects of group leaders on the occurrence of groupthink. The dissertation research implemented organized groups with a planted leader and a devil's advocate. Each group in the study was asked to place in order of importance a list of items in a “Lost At Sea” scenario. The leader who was planted in each group assumed either a directive or participative role as the experimenter desired. The assigned devil's advocate in the study assumed either the role of devil's advocate or that of an average group member as the experimenter desired. The findings of this study indicated that a directive leader causes groupthink to occur, whereas a participatory leader does not. The presence of a devil's advocate did not alter the occurrence of groupthink in this study, though Chen states that the unimportant nature of the task could have determined that.

“Quality of Decision Making and Group Norms” is an article by Tom Postmes, Russell Spears, and Sezgin Cihangir (2001) that discusses the role of group norms in the quality of decision-making. Their study provided that groups had controlled histories to develop the desired norms for each group. Those groups that developed consensus norms were less likely to debate or to take more time on decisions, and they were also more

likely to make the wrong decision. Groups that developed critical group norms were more likely to discuss, critique their options, spend time on their decisions, and to consistently make more correct decisions than consensus groups. The groups' norms affected both the quality of the decisions of the groups and how the groups viewed the information that was presented to them. Groups that view information provided by one individual (unshared information) as less important than information that is available immediately to all group members (shared information) are less likely to make correct decisions. Also, consensus groups tended to value shared information more highly than unshared information. Group cohesion was not affected by the manipulation of group norms. The experimenters state that groupthink is not an inevitable consequence of cohesion, but that the group's norms moderate the effect.

In "The Relationship of Argumentativeness and Verbal Aggressiveness to Cohesion, Consensus, and Satisfaction in Small Groups", a study by Carolyn M. Anderson and Matthew M. Martin (1999), the role of argumentative people and verbally aggressive people was examined in the small group context. The overall analysis of the theorists supported their hypothesis that argumentativeness is beneficial to group communication and that verbal aggressiveness is harmful and viewed as disrespectful, unprofessional, and undesirable behavior within the group. Verbal aggressiveness disrupts the group's cohesiveness and hinders positive relationships within the group. While argumentativeness assists in thoughtful decision-making, verbal aggressiveness is divisive and destroys positive group interactions. The article also states that, particularly in on-going groups, such as primary or social groups, the process of group decision-making effects the long-term interactions of the groups.

“How Male, Female, and Mixed-Gender Groups Regard Interaction and Leadership Differences in the Business Communication Course” is a study performed by Janet K. Winter, Joan C. Neal, and Karen K. Waner (2001) that examines the effects of gender on perceptions, choice of leaders, and decisions in groups. The results of their study showed that, while there are some differences in the approach of men and women to group tasks and discussion, the perceptions of the group members reflected a balance in cooperative group interactions and shared workloads. Women were considered more pleasant in group interactions while men were more aggressive and competitive. The study states that mixed-gender groups more often identify a “natural leader” than do all-female or all-male groups.

“Testing the Groupthink Model: Effects of promotional leadership and conformity predisposition” is an published study by Noni Richardson Ahlfinger (2001) that examines the effects of promotional leaders and nonpromotional leaders and the inclination to conform of group members on groupthink in groups. Their hypothesis was that groups in which leaders promoted their own opinions on the issues and tasks at hand were more likely to experience groupthink than those groups whose leaders did not promote a particular view over another. The hypothesis that predisposition to conformity causes groupthink to occur in groups was not supported by their research.

“Examining the Symptoms of Groupthink and Retrospective Sensemaking” is a study by David and Mary Henningsen Michael Cruz, and Jennifer Eden (2006) that examines the symptoms of groupthink and challenges that the occurrence of groupthink is the product of a single process. They hypothesize that groupthink is really a reflection of the occurrence of some members of a group having great confidence in the group’s

decision and some members of the group having doubts about the decision but stronger pressure to conform to the group's leading. They state that their study supports their hypothesis and that, because of this, Janis's theory of groupthink is less reliable than as recognized and believed. They also examine the role of retrospective sensemaking and hidden profiles in the occurrence or appearance of groupthink.

METHODOLOGY: Andres Claudio

The first step in determining a conclusion to any problem is gathering the proper evidence. That was no different in the researcher's case and they were presented with many potential obstacles that could have limited their field study. Luckily, they were able to brainstorm as a team and come up with several criteria for what groupthink is, what kinds of groups attain groupthink, and how often has groupthink occurred within the parameters of their groups. Surveys were the best, and most efficient way to calculate these queries. Since groupthink is not so much a cognitive phenomenon as much as it is an occurrence that is noticed "after-the-fact", the surveys that were handed out to the researcher's peers were varied.

When distributing surveys to various people and people groups, the researchers had to keep in mind that there are flaws that go along with that. They had to structure the questions in the surveys in a way that would not lead people to, or away from, the answers that they needed to support their argument. That would simply not be fair. The researcher's "Group Interaction Surveys" is what they came up with. The surveys went through a series of changes and revisions until they were satisfied with the end result; an unbiased survey to determine what groups are more prone to groupthink.

As aforementioned, their survey is entitled the "Group Interaction Survey". It consists of twelve close-ended (yes or no) questions. Each question was designed to detect one of the eight symptoms of groupthink Janis outlined. At the top of each survey are instructions for the individuals that ask them to choose their appropriate answers by circling "yes" or "no". Question number one asks, "Do you feel comfortable having and

voicing a different opinion than the rest of your group?” Question two asks, “Do you ever go along with group decisions just because the rest of the group is unanimous?” Question three asks, “Does your group often make bad decisions?” Question four asks, “If yes, do you talk about why those decisions weren’t the best?” Question five asks, “Does your group discourage disagreement?” Question six asks, “Is your group susceptible to make bad decisions?” Question seven asks, “Does your group avoid topics that are controversial?” Question eight asks, “Do you think your group has more positive qualities than other similar groups?” Question nine asks, “Does your group acknowledge all information available when making decisions?” Question ten asks, “Has a failure by your group ever surprised you?” Question eleven asks, “Is there a leader in your group who intimidates you?” Question twelve asks, “Have you expected long-term relationships in this group and been surprised by ended contact?”

Each member of the researcher’s group was assigned to pass out surveys to varied groups around town. For every targeted group, twenty surveys were passed out. The groups were Primary, Social or Casual Decision Making, Problem Solving, Educational/Therapeutic, Work Groups, and Mediated Communication. Upon completion of the surveys, the researchers had one hundred-twenty pieces of evidence that they were slowly able to piece together like a puzzle. The purpose of asking these surveys were, again, to gauge what groups are more susceptible to groupthink. Upon extensive research, the researchers will determine their findings and evaluate how to diagnose groupthink and attempt to reconcile this problem. The researchers understand that groupthink is not an exact science and that there are infinitely more scenarios and causes as to why it may occur, but they attempted a stab at the most user-friendly and

straight-forward position that they could reach. They have found that their “Group Interaction Survey” is highly effective and they recommend its duplication for any group that would like to resolve a problem or find an answer to something that is not common knowledge.

RESEARCH FINDINGS: Karisa Guetterman

Six types of groups were evaluated with a group interaction survey that studied the most common symptoms of groupthink. These symptoms were self centeredness, when group members focus on themselves instead of the group. Illusions of unanimity, members of a group may look to each other for confirmation before voicing an opinion, this is also a result from self censorship. Self censorship is when group members don't want to give opinions that differ from ones that have already been expressed. Collective rationalization; this is when the group may think they are looking at all options for a solution when in fact they may not be. This can then cause more pressure to just conform which is another common symptom. Mindguards, group members take it upon themselves to protect the group from negativity and trouble. Illusions of invulnerability, this can cause an attitude of everything is going to be ok, when in fact there is a problem. Dominant leader, this can cause people to feel intimidated and unwilling to participate. Stereotyping other groups; group members may think their group is better than others and judging other groups to make sure they are right. The last aspect studied was the inherent morality of the group.

The seven groups that were studied were primary groups, such as family; educational/therapeutic groups, such as weight watchers; online groups, such as fantasy football and myspace; social or casual groups, such as clubs and churches; work related groups; and problem solving groups, such as a jury. Twenty surveys were handed out to each group. The survey sample was primarily students between the ages of 18-25.

In the following survey, the highlighted fields indicate groupthink. In this questionnaire twelve questions were asked to evaluate ten aspects of common groupthink.

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Do you feel comfortable having and voicing a opinion than the rest of your group?
(Self centeredness) | Yes | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| 2. Do you ever go along with group decisions just because the rest of the group is unanimous?
(Illusions of unanimity) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes | No |
| 3. Does your group often make bad decisions? | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes | No |
| 4. If yes, do you talk about why those decisions weren't the best?
(Collective rationalization) | Yes | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| 5. Does your group discourage disagreement?
(Pressure to conform) | Yes | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| 6. Is morality a strong characteristic of your group as a whole?
(Morality) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes | No |
| 7. Does your group avoid topics that are controversial?
(Self censorship) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes | No |
| 8. Do you think your group has more positive qualities than other similar groups?
(Stereotyping) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes | No |
| 9. Does your group acknowledge all information available when making decisions?
(Mindguards) | Yes | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| 10. Has a failure by your group ever surprised you?
(Illusions of invulnerability) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes | No |
| 11. Is there a leader in your group who intimidates you?
(Dominant leader) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes | No |
| 12. Have you expected long term relationships in this group (or in similar groups) and been surprised by ended contact?
(Illusions of invulnerability) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes | No |

	Self-Centeredness	Illusions of Unanimity	Collective Rationalization	Pressure to Conform	Morality
Primary	10%	80%	40%	80%	50%
Educational	20%	85%	30%	85%	50%
Online	5%	40%	35%	80%	50%
Social	10%	55%	20%	55%	20%
Work	30%	80%	25%	80%	55%
Problem Solving	0%	10%	0%	90%	5%

	Self-Censorship	Stereotyping	Mindguards	Illusions of Invulnerability	Dominant Leader
Primary	25%	80%	40%	40%	50%
Educational	25%	65%	45%	50%	25%
Online	15%	80%	40%	40%	5%
Social	35%	70%	15%	90%	25%
Work	40%	80%	45%	30%	40%
Problem Solving	5%	15%	95%	70%	10%

The first group evaluated was primary groups. According to our research this group had the highest amount of groupthink detected by the survey. Of the people we surveyed 55% of them answered questions to indicated group think. Among the surveyed, 80% said their primary group had illusions of unanimity, 80% of them said there was pressure on them to conform to the rest of the group, and 80% said that they stereotype other primary groups like their's. Considering the most common primary group is ones family, group think was expected. Generally a father is the head of a household and is expected to lead the group in a decision making process.

Educational and therapeutic groups tested to have and average of 53% groupthink. Much like primary groups, educational groups have high amounts of illusions of unanimity and pressure to conform. Our studies show that they have even a higher rate of

both. According to the survey results 85% of the people sampled felt they had an illusion of unanimity and 85% said they were pressured to conform as well.

Online groups resulted in having only 49.5% group think. Although they too said that in their groups 80% of the time they felt pressure to conform to the rest of the group. Online groups also showed stereotyping is also very common among their group. 80% of the time, members negatively stereotype other online groups.

Social groups are a bit different than the last three groups discussed. Our survey showed social and community groups of having groupthink 48% of the time. It is known social groups tend to result in higher amounts of stereotyping because they are more susceptible to cliques. Our studies show that they resulted in 70% stereotyping. Social groups hold the record for having illusions of invulnerability, 90% of the people surveyed said their group falls victim to thinking they are invulnerable.

Our survey shows that work related groups and primary groups were identical in the top three aspects of groupthink. Our findings concluded that they too fall victim to illusions of unanimity, 80%, pressure to conform, 80%, and stereotyping of others, 80%. The accumulated totals were slightly different with a result of 54% over all groupthink in work related groups, compared to primary groups, having 55% over all groupthink. Much like primary groups, work groups have a leader who has control and jurisdiction over their employees. Therefore it is understandable that a boss acts in a lot of the same way a head of the household would.

Problem solving groups had the lowest amount of accumulated groupthink. With an outcome of only 40% groupthink the three main symptoms of groupthink here were pressure to conform, mindguards and illusions of invulnerability. Our studies showed

95% of our sample had problems with mindguards. The mindguards that the people develop result in pressures people will have to conform thus having a symptom total of 90%. The last symptom that was predominant was illusions of invulnerability with a percentage of 70%. It was anticipated that this group would have the lowest amount of over all percentage of groupthink. This is because often times discussion, opinions and points of view are highly encouraged in problem solving groups.

Of the ten most common symptoms of groupthink, there were three that were common in at least four out five groups each. The three most common symptoms of these studies were illusions of unanimity, pressures to conform, and stereotyping other groups.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Heath Hudnall

When doing this study, there are many things that leave the findings and the results lacking. The study is highly inconclusive when it comes to the various types of groups and the area in which the study was done. There are several other ways the study could have been conducted, several other factors that could have been considered, and a variety of other methods that could have been used.

The types of groups that were used were very strict in the study. Within each category of group there are countless other subcategories which should have been considered. For example, the specific surveying of primary groups could have been broken into single-mother and single-father homes versus two-parent homes or families that include grandparents or grandchildren in the home. In the work groups surveyed, the amount of people and the types of projects undertaken were not considered. An entirely new study could be conducted just on the different types of work groups or social groups that people are involved in and how groupthink could be different for different types of subcategories.

The varying degrees of groupthink could have been surveyed differently in the study. The surveys could have had a grading system of the exact level of groupthink or specifically targeted certain characteristics of groupthink. More specific surveys could have been conducted on the different aspects of groupthink, such as the illusion of invulnerability and the self-censorship. These characteristics need further study and should be considered as largely independent of one other for the purposes of a new study.

Another thing that could be considered for further study would be the area in

which this study was done. The study was done in its entirety in south-central Virginia. It was done on a conservative college campus. These two factors are huge in this type of study. The study could have been done on people from all over the U. S. and in all different types of places. The southern atmosphere affected the types of groups the researchers would find.

The age group on which the study was done was college-aged students ranging from 18-23 years old. The groups in which these people would be are limited in their extent. A survey could be conducted on different age brackets, perhaps those who are older and farther into the professional world. Specific to families, people who are older do not tend to be as close or as affected by their families.

The methods were not exhaustive. More than simply 120 surveys could have been handed out, and more questions could have been added for deeper investigation. Study groups could have been conducted in order to actually converse with those that were studied. In study groups, answers could have been a bit deeper and more insightful than just a simple “yes” or “no” answer. Interviews with entire groups could have also been helpful in determining the level of groupthink.

WORKS CITED

- Ahlfinger, Noni Richardson. "Testing the groupthink model: Effects of promotional leadership and conformity predisposition." Social Behavior and Personality (2001) 1-8. 21 October 2007
<http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3852/is_200101/ai_n8948657>.
- Anderson, Carolyn M., and Matthew M. Martin. "The Relationship of Argumentativeness and Verbal Aggressiveness to Cohesion, Consensus, and Satisfaction in Small Groups." Communication Reports. Winter 1999: 21-31. Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. Liberty University Library, Lynchburg, Va. 3 October 2007.
<<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=1697431&site=ehost=live>>.
- Baldwin, John R., Stephen D. Perry, and Mary Anne Moffit. Communication Theories for Everyday Life. Boston: Pearson, 2004.
- Chen, Zenglo. "Groupthink: Deciding with the Leader and the Devil." Psychological Record 46(1996).
- Cline, Rebecca J. Welch. "Detecting Groupthink: Methods for Observing The Illusion of Unanimity." Communication Quarterly 38.2 (Spring 1990): 112-126.
Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. Pierre Guillerman Library, Lynchburg, Va. 3 October 2007.

<<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=18452257&site=ehost-live>>.

Courtright, John A. "A Laboratory Investigation of Groupthink." Communication Monographs 45.3 (Aug. 1978): 229. Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. Pierre Guillerman Library, Lynchburg, Va. 3 October 2007.

<<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=10005684&site=ehost-live>>.

Henningsen, David Dryden, Mary Lynn Miller Henningsen, Jennifer Eden, and Michael G. Cruz. "Examining the Symptoms of Groupthink and Retrospective Sensemaking." Small Group Research. 37(2006): 36-64.

Postmes, Tom, Russell Spears, and Sezgin Cihangir. "Quality of Decision Making and Group Norms." Journal of Personality & Social Psychology 80(2001): 918-930.

Keltner, John W. "GROUPTHINK" And Individual Thinking. Today's Speech 5.2 (Apr. 1957): 5-6. Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. Pierre Guillerman Library, Lynchburg, Va. 26 October 2007.

<<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=18592252&site=ehost-live>>.

Mann, Carl P. "How to Remove Groupthink from Executive Decision-Making." Public Relations Quarterly 31.3 (Fall 1986): 28. Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. Pierre Guillerman Library, Lynchburg, Va. 3 October 2007.

<<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=4471778&site=ehost-live>>.

“The Bay of Pigs”. [Thinkquest.org](http://library.thinkquest.org). 1997. 26 Oct. 2007. <

http://library.thinkquest.org/11046/days/bay_of_pigs.html>.

Winter, Janet K., Joan C. Neal, and Karen K. Waner. "How Male, Female, and Mixed-Gender Groups regard Interaction and Leadership Differences in the Business Communication Course." Business Communication Quarterly 64(2001): 43-58.

APPENDIX

COMS 330: Group 4 - Group Interaction Survey

Please circle the appropriate answer about your group. Circle "Yes" if the answer is ever true of your group.

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Do you feel comfortable having and voicing a different opinion than the rest of your group? | Yes | No |
| 2. Do you ever go along with group decisions just because the rest of the group is unanimous? | Yes | No |
| 3. Does your group often make bad decisions? | Yes | No |
| 4. If yes, do you talk about why those decisions weren't the best? | Yes | No |
| 5. Does your group discourage disagreement? | Yes | No |
| 6. Is your group susceptible to make bad decisions? | Yes | No |
| 7. Does your group avoid topics that are controversial? | Yes | No |
| 8. Do you think your group has more positive qualities than other similar groups? | Yes | No |
| 9. Does your group acknowledge all information available when making decisions? | Yes | No |
| 10. Has a failure by your group ever surprised you? | Yes | No |
| 11. Is there a leader in your group who intimidates you? | Yes | No |
| 12. Have you expected long term relationships in this group and been surprised by ended contact? | Yes | No |

