Module 3

Groups in Organisations

Introduction

Groups in organisations discuss the effect of relationships in groups and also the distinctions between group and individual behaviour. A distinction will be made between groups and teams as well as the effect that groups have on work design.

Upon completion of this module you will be able to:

Outcomes

- *define* groups and *explain* the benefits of joining a group.
- *identify* the different types of group.
- *outline* the stages of group development.
- *explain* how the Punctuated Equilibrium Model works for the group.
- *understand* the roles group members play.
- *run* an effective group meeting.
- *differentiate* between teams and groups.
- *understand* the importance of group composition and groupthink.

Terminology

Terminology

Formal Groups:	Formal groups have an official designation as a group, and it is the objective of this group to perform a specific organisational purpose. They can be permanent or temporary work groups.
Group:	Two or more people working together to achieve common goals. Typically, group size in the workplace ranges from three to 20 people.
Groupthink:	Groupthink is a phenomenon which can lead to faulty group decisions. It usually occurs in highly cohesive groups and arises when team members try to avoid being too critical in judging other team members' ideas.
Informal Groups:	Informal groups are not formally designated as groups by the organisation. Rather they emerge from frequent contact and are based on personal

relationships or common interests. Often informal groups develop within formal groups, and can exert considerable power over decision making.

Punctuated Equilibrium Model:	This model is suggested when groups are working toward a deadline, the behaviour of the group develops in a curious sequence (such as from first critical to midpoint change to rush to completion).
Self-Managed Work Team:	Groups of employees that complete an entire piece of work while having considerable autonomy over the way in which they accomplish their work.
Team:	A formal group of people interacting very closely together with a shared commitment to accomplish agreed upon objectives.

Introduction: working in groups

Module 1 discussed a number of trends that imply the need for organisations to demonstrate flexibility and adaptability in a rapidly changing environment. One of the priorities that has emerged in many organisations is a need to understand and remain close to the customer in an effort to remain competitive. In response to this need, many organisations have moved towards more teamwork. We have seen middle management and supervisory levels replaced with self-directed teams across many organisational settings. A number of benefits of groups have been identified:

- they satisfy important membership needs

- they can provide a wide range of activities for individual members

- they can provide support through periods of crisis or stress

- groups tend to make use of good problem-solving tools

- groups tend to make better decisions than individuals do

- group decisions tend to be willingly carried out

- they can control and discipline individual members in ways that are often difficult with impersonal disciplinary systems

- as organisations grow large, small groups seem to be useful mechanisms for benefitting from the positive effects of small versus large.

Source: based on Leavitt (1975)

This module will define groups and discuss types of groups and group behaviour. It is important to understand the nature of groups and the integral role they play within organisations in order to improve both group and team performance.

Groups defined and group benefits

A group is defined as two or more people working together to achieve common goals. Groups are formed for a number of reasons, and are a ubiquitous part of our work and non-work activities. Typically, group size in the workplace ranges from three to 20 people. We benefit in a number of ways from joining groups:

- **Security**: people who are part of a group generally feel more secure about their behaviour. They have fewer doubts, and are more resistant to threats when they are part of a group.

- **Status**: inclusion in a group is viewed as important by others and it provides recognition and status for its members.

- **Self-esteem**: people often feel more confident and have increased self-worth as a result of participation in a group.

- **Affiliation**: Groups can fulfil social needs. People enjoy the interaction that comes with group membership, and often it is their primary source of satisfaction for their affiliation needs.

- **Power**: the 'power in numbers' philosophy supports this finding, that groups can often achieve more.

- **Goal achievement**: Often, in order to achieve specific goals various talents must be pooled together. It not only facilitates completion of a job but increases the quality of the output.

Types of groups

Formal versus informal groups

Formal groups have an official designation as a group, and it is the objective of this group to perform a specific organisational purpose. They can be permanent or temporary work groups. Permanent work groups perform their task on an ongoing basis – the research and development area, for example, may be made up of a permanent work group that conducts R&D for the organisation. Another example may be a formal group within the organisation that manages all social events for its members.

Temporary formal work groups are often formed to address a specific issue or problem, and these groups typically disband once they have accomplished their objectives.

Temporary work groups tend to be cross-functional. Because there is a limited time to complete this task, it is likely that decisions will be made faster with a cross-functional team, where representatives from various functional areas or departments are in one place together simultaneously. Often temporary change teams are formed in order to effect planned change within an organisation. Perhaps the supply chain management area of an organisation would like to reduce costs by 10 per cent over the

next year. A cross-functional team might be formed for a period of four-to-six months in order to redesign processes related to that function.

Informal groups are not formally designated as groups by the organisation. Rather they emerge from frequent contact and are based on personal relationships or common interests. Often informal groups develop within formal groups, and can exert considerable power over decision making. Members within the organisation might form a chess club, based on mutual interest in that game.

Stages of group development

As you may be aware from your own experience, membership and participation in groups can be challenging, stressful, unpredictable and sometimes conflict-ridden. Groups tend to go through stages of development over time (which look different across groups), and this section will discuss the five-stage model of group development. The five stages are characterised as follows:

1. **Forming**

This is the stage at which we are treading a bit carefully, asking questions, and collecting information. We tend to be on our best behaviour during this initial stage, and may feel the superficiality of behaviours around us. Groups typically do not move to the next stage until individuals feel that they are part of the group. They have, at the end of this stage, some understanding of group purpose, expectations and behaviour.

2. **Storming**

In the storming stage, the group experiences tension, and conflict emerges over objectives and goals of the group, as well as issues of leadership and competition. It is not unusual for coalitions to form within the group, and in order to move to the next stage, members must clarify expectations and roles and develop some understanding (and acceptance) of individual needs within the group. In order to successfully emerge from this stage, effective leadership is required; leadership that communicates the safety of the group and demonstrates the need for a unified vision. Storming is a normal development stage for most groups.

3. **Norming**

This is also referred to as the initial integration stage; after clarification of roles and expectations in the storming stage, the group establishes itself as a working unit, and individuals tend to work much more in sync with each other. But the best is yet to come!

4. Performing

This fourth stage is also referred to as the total integration stage, and at the performing stage, the group is handling and analysing problems in a way that integrates each participant's contribution synergistically. Group members know and understand each other, and make use of this knowledge (and their experience with the group) to realise planned objectives.

5. Adjourning

For groups that have a temporary task to perform, this stage helps to prepare them for disbandment. The group's primary focus is on closure, and ideally, the members will reflect on their achievements and performance positively.

An understanding of the five stages of group development is useful in that it facilitates problem-solving; it often helps members and group leaders manage through development and crisis. It is important to note that this model does not apply to all groups, and often groups move back and forth between the stages of development throughout their group experience.

The punctuated equilibrium model

This model suggests that when groups are working toward a specific deadline, that the behaviour of the group develops in a curious sequence. The group research conducted by Connie Gersick uncovered a sequence that indicates an equilibrium or stability within the group, punctuated by a critical first meeting, a midpoint change in group activity, and then a rush to complete the task toward the end of the project.

During the first half of a project, a great deal of the content of group interaction is based on routines, known as schema guided automatic processing. The main functional value of routines is efficiency. Some tasks are accomplished more effectively when they have become habitual. Group routines are maintained for a number of reasons: 1) social impact factors (the size of the group often makes change difficult), 'entrainment', which is calibration to a particular kind of response pattern, and cost of change (including political costs).

Gersick's research suggests that every group, throughout a project life, goes through a transition, where the group drops old patterns, and adopts a new perspective on their work, which helps facilitate dramatic progress. In the first half of the project, group members' pacing patterns are more idiosyncratic, and there tends to be reluctance to compromise with group mates. The midpoint of a project marks a time of change for most groups: it launches them into a different activity level. After the midpoint, groups typically are more likely to have a majority agreement. Often toward the end of the project, there is an additional burst of energy to complete the project.

Think about your own group experiences. Did you sense the kind of inertia that Gersick describes early on in your project? Was there a point at which the group engaged in a markedly different pace of activity when time and deadline issues emerged as critical?

Group roles

Individual group members tend to play distinct roles in an effort to facilitate group progress. Typically a member says or does something with a view to accomplishing one of three things: completion of a task (task role), managing relationships within the group (maintenance role), or satisfying some personal need (individual or self-oriented role).[3]

Descriptions of these role types follow.

Task roles

Persons in such roles focus on the task or work being done. A group member in this role tends to focus on human and economic resources and various sources of information that are required to accomplish or complete the work itself. In terms of human resources, members of the group may play different task roles: coordinating workloads, problem solver, creating strategies to complete the work, for example.

Maintenance roles

This is one of the most critical roles in a group, and is often the role of one or two people, but not because the group has chosen them; it is just their nature to facilitate communication and activity. This person tries to ensure that harmony is created and maintained in the group, and that every member of the group has a fair chance to participate. This role is often called a gate keeping role – someone who maintains a 'check' on the temperature of the group. Without this role, groups often become so task-oriented that they don't realise whether or not all the ideas have been put on the table for discussion; they are tunnel-visioned.

Individual roles

These are like the cancerous cells in a body: they are dysfunctional and destructive, each serving to infect the cells around it. People in individual roles do not consider the needs of the group beyond their own. They typically interrupt others, are 'know-it-alls', or do not listen effectively to understand the contribution that others are making.

Effective group meetings

If the meetings held in your work environment occur often but seem inefficient, you may feel frustrated by the unproductive quality of the time you spend in them. A number of preparatory and group management tools might be of value to you:

- **Prepare a meeting agenda**: An agenda defines what you hope to accomplish at the meeting. It should state the meeting's purpose;

who will be in attendance; what, if any, preparation is required of each participant; a detailed list of items to be covered; the specific time and location of the meeting; and a specific finishing time.

- **Distribute the agenda in advance**: participants should have the agenda sufficiently in advance so they can adequately prepare for the meeting.

- **Consult with participants before the meeting**: an unprepared participant can't contribute to his or her full potential. It is your responsibility to ensure that members are prepared, so check with them ahead of time.

- **Get participants to go over the agenda**: The first thing to do at the meeting is to have participants review the agenda, make any changes, and then approve the final agenda.

- **Establish specific parameters**: meetings should begin on time and have a specific time for completion. It is your responsibility to specify these time parameters and to hold to them.

- **Maintain focussed discussion**: it is your responsibility to give direction to the discussion; to keep it focussed on the issues, and to minimise interruptions, disruptions, and irrelevant comments.

- **Encourage and support participation of all members**: to maximise the effectiveness of problem-oriented meetings, each participant must be encouraged to contribute. Quiet or reserved personalities need to be drawn out so their ideas can be heard.

- **Maintain a balanced style**: the effective group leader pushes when necessary and is passive when need be.

- **Encourage the clash of ideas**: you need to encourage different points of view, critical thinking, and constructive disagreement.

- **Discourage the clash of personalities**: An effective meeting is characterised by the critical assessment of ideas, not attacks on people. When running a meeting, you must quickly intercede to stop personal attacks or other forms of verbal insults.

- **Be an effective listener**: you need to listen with intensity, empathy and objectivity, and do whatever is necessary to get the full intended meaning from each participant's comments.

Bring proper closure: you should close a meeting by summarising the group's accomplishments; clarifying what actions, if any, need to follow the meeting; and allocating follow-up assignments. If any decisions are made, you also need to determine who will be responsible for communicating and implementing them.

Teams versus groups – what's the difference?

The primary distinction between a work group and a work team is that the sum of the parts in a work team is greater than the whole; there are

distinct synergistic effects of individual efforts. Therefore it has been argued that a team is something more than a group. There are a number of specific distinctions between a group and a team:

- **Shared leadership**: teams have shared leadership roles, whereas groups usually have a strong, focussed leader.

- **Accountability**: teams have individual and mutual accountability, whereas groups are based mostly on individual accountability.

- **Purpose**: teams work toward a specific purpose, whereas a group's purpose is usually identical to the organisation's mission.

- **Work products**: teams deliver collective work products, whereas groups have individual work products.

- **Communication**: teams encourage open-ended discussion and active problem-solving meetings, whereas groups attempt to run meetings that are efficient.

- **Effectiveness**: teams measure performance by direct assessment of their collective work products, whereas groups measure effectiveness indirectly by their influence on others.

- **Work style**: teams discuss, decide, and delegate but do the work together, whereas groups discuss, decide and delegate, and then do the work individually.

The rise of self-managed work teams

Complex issues face decision-makers, and organisations are turning their attention to group and team problem-solving. Successful self-managed work teams, however, require a number of conditions, including commitment from management, mutual trust between employees and managers, a commitment to training, choosing operations appropriate to team problem-solving, and union participation. These are discussed in more detail below.

Commitment from management

Commitment from top management is necessary, but not sufficient for work teams to function effectively. Part of this commitment includes leadership styles, the need for top management to commit the resources, both human and economic, that teams need to function and get the work done. Often what appears to be commitment from management is not evident through a project's life. Initial 'espoused commitment' is apparent, but in reality, often this commitment is not sustained, or is understood by many teams to be superficial at best.

Mutual trust between employees and managers

Trust is not something that emerges automatically, and real trust takes time. Certainly, one way to foster trust as a manager in a work environment is to demonstrate integrity. When you suggest that you will take responsibility to complete a task, it must be completed. In addition, trust depends on sharing of information and ideas. This helps to deflect

power and political struggles, and suggests that you respect and trust others.

Training

It's great to create teams, give them autonomy, and tell them to come up with a plan, but if they don't know how to do these things, that will be an enormous and unrealistic challenge. People do not always instinctively know how to behave in a group or team. How does one introduce ideas, behave, contradict others, offer better alternatives, deal with shyness, overcome stress, etc? People do not just go into a group, after years or even months of working as individuals, and immediately start contributing effectively. It is the responsibility of management within the organisation to provide appropriate training with respect to team dynamics, functioning and effectiveness, so that one will understand enough to believe in a new process.

Realistic objectives

Team members should understand what is realistic in terms of a work load, and in terms of overall objectives. It's great to set aggressive timelines and project deliverables, but it's worse when those established deliverables cannot be met because team members were not realistic about their ability to 'get all that done'!

Strong links between strategy and implementation

Conceptually, teams can come up with wonderful strategic directions and plans; this is the fun part of the job. However, when the plan is cascaded down to members who are expected to implement this plan, it sometimes begins to unravel. Implementation requires enormous support. What sometimes happens is that the people implementing various change applications find some components of the 'vision' idealistic and/or unachievable. It is important to ensure through the planning process, that the organisation has the appropriate resources to successfully implement planned objectives.

Group composition

When you have had an opportunity to form your own groups or teams, why have you chosen specific people to work with? There are a number of criteria that we may employ in choosing group members or teammates. However, often we will choose others that we have worked with before and people with whom we share similar views. These people are attractive to us, because our shared perspectives facilitate decision-making and create group cohesiveness quickly.

In **homogeneous groups** members tend to be similar to one another, and therefore find it easy to work together. While this is an attractive feature for group members, it threatens performance of the group when skills, experiences, perceptions, problem-solving abilities are too similar. The complexity of tasks often necessitates a creative, innovative, multiple perspective approach to problem-solving that might be facilitated with diverse perspectives.

In **heterogeneous groups**, group cohesion generally does not emerge as readily. When group members differ in age, personalities, education, gender, experience, and functional specialisation, assimilation among diverse positions is difficult. As a result, decisions are often more time-consuming, and conflict-ridden. Yet some of the research indicates that it is often conflict that stimulates creativity and idea generation, which leads to improved decision-making. The results are mixed for groups that are culturally heterogeneous; racial or national differences tend to have more difficulty working with each other because of cultural norms. These groups tend to report less cohesiveness and less satisfaction with the group. But the difficulties and challenges faced by the groups because of cultural diversity tend to dissipate over time.

Advantages	Disadvantages
Multiple perspectives	Ambiguity
Greater openness to new ideas	Complexity
Multiple interpretations	Confusion
Increased creativity	Miscommunication
Increased flexibility	Difficulty in reaching agreement
Increased problem-solving skills	Difficulty in agreeing on specific actions

Table 3.1 Advantages and disadvantages of diversity

Groupthink

You might recall a time when you were part of a group, and wanted to express your opinion that was inconsistent with other group members, but you decided against it. You might have been a victim of **groupthink**.

Groupthink is a phenomenon which can lead to faulty group decisions. It usually occurs in highly cohesive groups and arises when team members try to avoid being too critical in judging other team members' ideas. It is certainly more pleasant for us when we can agree with our group-mates.

See if you can recognise some of the symptoms of groupthink.

Illusion of invulnerability: group members become overconfident among themselves, allowing them to take extraordinary risks.

Assumption of morality: group members believe highly in the moral rightness of the group's objectives and do not feel the need to debate the ethics of their actions.

Rationalised resistance: group members rationalise any resistance to the assumptions they have made. No matter how strongly the evidence may contradict their basic assumptions, members behave so as to reinforce those assumptions continually.

Peer pressure: members apply direct pressures on those who momentarily express doubts about any of the group's shared views or who question the validity of arguments supporting the alternative favoured by the majority.

Minimised doubts: those members who have doubts or hold differing points of view seek to avoid deviating from what appears to be group consensus by keeping silent about misgivings and even minimising to themselves the importance of their doubts.

Illusion of unanimity: if someone doesn't speak, it's assumed that he or she is in full accord. In other words, abstention becomes viewed as a 'yes' vote.

Module summary

Summary

In this module you have learned about groups (and teams) in an organisation. Groups can be viewed from a number of perspectives; one such perspective is to consider a group may as two or more people interacting with each other to accomplish a common goal. Formal or informal groups exist for a number of reasons. Security, status, affiliation, power and goal achievement are typical reasons. As groups form and develop, they tend to go through several stages (forming, storming, norming, performing and adjourning). To understand group behaviour, it is essential to be aware that formal and informal groups exhibit certain characteristics. Formal work groups include command groups, task forces, teams, and self-managed work teams. Informal work groups include friendship groups and interest groups. The primary distinction between work groups and a work team are on the concept of shared leadership, accountability, their purpose, work products, communication, effectiveness and working style. Group composition refers to the characteristics of group members (homogeneous vs. heterogeneous). Groupthink is the deterioration of mental efficiency, reality judgment and moral judgment of the individual members of a group.

Case study 3.1

Please read the following case study and answer the questions below.

Case study

Levi Strauss & Co.'s Flirtation with Teams

The Levi Strauss & Co. is the largest clothing manufacturer in the United States. It has a long history of being profitable, good to its workers, and charitable to its factory towns. Compared with other companies in the apparel industry, Levi Strauss is known for generous wages and good working conditions. According to CEO Robert Haas, Levi's treatment of its workers and concern for their welfare is far greater than in other companies in the industry.

When other American apparel firms moved their manufacturing offshore, Levi Strauss & Co. maintained a large American manufacturing base and was often ranked as one of the best companies to work for. In fact, in 1997 the company received an award from the United Nations for improving global workplace standards.

Until 1992, Levi's employees worked on their own operating machines in which they performed a single, specific, and repetitive task, such as sewing zippers or belt loops on jeans. Pay was based on a piece-rate system, in which workers were paid a set amount for each piece of work completed. A worker's productivity and pay was highly dependent on levels of skill, speed and stamina.

By 1992, however, Levi Strauss & Co. began to feel the pressure of overseas, low-cost competitors, and realised the need to increase productivity and reduce costs in order to remain competitive and keep their North American plants open. The company decided that the best solution was teamwork. In a memo sent to workers, Levi's operations vice-president wrote, "This change will lead to help employees become more productive". Teamwork was felt to be a humane, safe and profitable solution that would be consistent with the company's philosophy.

Gone was the old system of performing a single task all the time and the piece-rate system that went with it. Now groups of 10 to 50 workers shared the tasks and would be paid for the total number of trousers that the group completed. The team system was expected to lower the monotony of piece-work by enabling workers to do different tasks and to therefore lower repetitive-stress injuries.

Although employees were given brief seminars and training on team-building and problem-solving, it was not long before problems began to arise. Top performers complained about their less-skilled and slower teammates that caused a decline in their wages. Meanwhile, the wages of lower-skilled workers increased. Threats, insults and group infighting became a regular part of daily work as faster workers tried to rid their group of slower workers. To make matters worse, top performers

responded to their lower wages by reducing their productivity. Not surprisingly, employee morale began to deteriorate.

Another problem was that whenever a group member was absent or slow, the rest of the team had to make up for it. This exacerbated the infighting among team members and resulted in excessive peer pressure. In one instance, an enraged worker had to be restrained from throwing a chair at a team member who constantly harassed her about working too slow, and in another incident, a worker threatened to kill a member of her team. An off-duty sheriff's deputy had to be placed at the plant's front entrance.

Because the groups had limited supervision, they had to resolve group problems on their own, and they also divided up the work of absent members themselves. In some plants, team members would chase each other out of the bathroom and nurse's station. Slower teammates were often criticized, needled, and resented by their group. Some could not take the resentment and simply quit. In one group, a member was voted off her team because she planned to have hand surgery.

And although workers were now part of a team system, management was not given guidance on how to implement the system. As a result, each manager had his or her own idea of how the team system should work, including team size, structure, pay formulas, and shop-floor layouts. One former production manager described the situation as worse than chaos and more like hell!

To make matters worse, the team system did not improve the situation for Levi's. Labour and overhead costs increased by up to 25 per cent during the first years of the team system.

Efficiency, based on the quantity of pants produced per hour worked, dropped to 77 per cent of pre-team levels. Although productivity began to improve, it was only at 93 per cent of piece-work levels. Even in some of the company's best plants, production fell and remained at lower levels after the introduction of teams. And although one of the reasons for adopting the team system was to lower the high costs of injuries that resulted from workers pushing themselves to achieve piece-rate goals, these costs continued to rise in many plants even after the team approach was implemented.

Profit margins also began to decline as competitors began offering private-label jeans at two-thirds the price of Levi's, and Levi's market share of men's denim jeans in the United States fell from 48 per cent in 1990 to 26 per cent in 1997. As costs continued to increase, plant managers were warned that they would face an uncertain future unless they cut costs by 28 per cent by the end of the year.

Teams did, however, result in some improvements. For example, the average turnaround time of receiving an order and shipping it was reduced from nine to seven weeks. As well, because the teams were responsible for producing completed pairs of pants, there was less work in process at the end of each day compared with the piece-rate system,

where each worker did only one part of the job. And according to CEO Robert Haas, teams allowed workers to manage themselves and to find better and safer ways of working.

Nonetheless, the system did not help Levi's achieve its objectives. In February, 1997, Haas announced that the company would cut its salaried workforce by 20 per cent in the next 12 months. The following November, the company closed 11 factories in the United States and laid off 6,395 workers. In an unusual response to being laid off, one worker described it as a "relief" from the burden and stress that had become part of her job.

In February 1999, as sales of Levi's jeans continued to fall, the company let go another 5,900 or 30 per cent of its workforce of 19,900 in the United States and Canada and announced it would close 11 of its remaining 22 plants in North America. According to company officials, plant closings might have been sooner and job losses greater if they had not adopted the team system.

Commenting on the team approach, a now-retired former manufacturing manager said, "We created a lot of anxiety and pain and suffering in our people, and for what?" According to a production manager who has taken early retirement, "It's just not the same company anymore. The perceived value of the individual and the concern for people is just not there." A veteran worker who has gone back to the old system of doing a single task and is now paid in part for what she produces said, "I hate teams. Levi's is not the place it used to be."

While officials said they plan to stick with the team approach in the remaining American plants, managers say that the team approach is on its way out as they search for other ways to increase productivity, like the old way of doing things.

In recent years, Levi Strauss & Co. has begun to contract out much of its work and now manufactures 45 per cent of its jeans for the American market outside North America, compared with 15 per cent in 1991, and none before that. Although it remains one of the last major American-based apparel companies with a substantial amount of company-owned production in North America, it now contracts manufacturing in 50 countries worldwide.

Source: Johns & Saks (2001, pp. 234-236)

Case Study Questions

1. Discuss stages of group development and the implications of them for the development of the teams of Levi Strauss.

2. Discuss some of the norms that emerged in the teams. What was their function and how did they influence the behaviour of group members?

3. The teams were supposed to be self-managing. Critique this idea based on what you know about the principles of self-managed teams.

4. Do you think it was a good idea for Levi Strauss & Co. to implement a team system? Was it the best solution to deal with increased global competition? Why wasn't the team approach at Levi Strauss more effective, and with your knowledge of groups, what might you do differently if you had to implement a team system at Levi Strauss?

5. What does the Levi Strauss experience tell us about the use of teams and their effectiveness?

Case study 3.2

Computer services team at avionics

Please read case study 3.2. 'Computer services team at avionics' in the case study handbook of your study materials and analyse this case using the written case format provided in the handbook. Your paper should be no longer than eight pages.

Case study

Assessment

Assessment

1. Distinguish between formal and informal groups. Why is it important for managers to understand informal groups?

2. How do groups differ from teams, and under what circumstances might one be more effective than the other?

3. Do you believe that diversity in groups is necessary? Why?

4. What might you do to ensure that members in your group do not become victims of groupthink?

References

References

Adler, N. J. (1991). *Internal dimensions of organizational behaviour.* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South Western College Publishing.

Benne, K. D. & Sheats, P. (1948). Functional roles of group members. *Journal of Social Issues, 2*, pp. 42-47.

Francesco, A. & Gold, B. (1998). *International organizational behaviour.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gersick, C. J. G. (1988, March). Time and transition in work teams: Toward a new model of group development. *Academy of Management Journal*, pp.9-41.

Janis, I. L. (1982). *Groupthink.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Johns, G. & Saks, A. (2001). *Organizational behaviour.* (5th ed.). Toronto, Canada: Addison Wesley Longman, pp. 234-236

Leavitt, H. J. (1975). Suppose We Took Groups Seriously. In E. L Cass & F. G. Zimmer (Eds.), *Man and work in society*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, pp.67-77.

Robbins, S. & Langton, N. (2001). *Organizational behaviour.* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Robbins, S. P. & Hunsaker, P. L. (1996). *Training in interpersonal skills*. (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, pp.168-184.

Tuckman, B. W. (1965, June). Developmental sequences in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, pp. 384-399.

Watson, W. E., Kumar, K. & Michaelsen, L. K. (1993, June) Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, pp. 590-602.