1. The resource I found is quite spectacular. Not only does it specify the group decision making process in (a), but it dives into group motivations for decisions, the type of meetings where decisions are made, and leadership roles which help or impede group decision making.

a. The first step is **Problem Identification**. This is where the problem is defined, some causes and faults are shown, and a set of criteria for a successful solution is developed. During this step, the group needs to be sure to not cause defensiveness of any members, to invoke mutual interests, and to be clear on the primary objective.

Step two is **Problem Diagnosis.** Here, the group develops dependent and independent variables to represent potential causes of the problem. In this step, it is crucial not to assess the blame.

Step three is **Solution Generation**. This is when the group comes up but a number of possible solutions before evaluating them.

Step four is **Solution Evaluation** **And Choice**. During this step, the group evaluates alternative solutions using constraints set during the first step. Key in this step is dealing with conflicting criteria such as maximizing versus satisfying.

Step five is **Problem Identification**. During step five, unlike step one, a solution has been chosen. In this step, the problem becomes reducing the expected resistance to the change.

Step six is **Evaluation**. During this final step, the group evaluates the solutions effectiveness without creating new problems.

b. A good example I can think of for the steps above is Project 3 that our group just completed. We went through step one using the project’s requirements and set forth a few limits such as the project can’t be too expensive. For step two, we didn’t really have too much to do. We did figure out who knew of activities and who wanted to research those activities. Step three was a small hassle for us as DeQuan and I pitched a bunch of ideas to the group. Step four seemed easy as we all threw some ideas out because they were expensive or difficult. We culminated on the Hoops of Lava as our solution. Step five for us was just creating proper instructions for completing the activity. Step six seems to have been the feedback memo and the evaluations by the class.

c. Scholl, R. (2003). Group Decision Making and Problem Solving. Retrieved from: <http://www.uri.edu/research/lrc/scholl/webnotes/Group_DM.htm>

d. I am.

2.

a. I found some possible reasons for impeded creativity, and I also found a great list of how to encourage creativity.

Here are some things that impede creativity: Conforming to group norms, lack of collaboration, defensive climate, differences in communication styles, cultural norms.

Here are some things I found that encourage creativity: the first is embracing diversity. When members embrace diversity, they seek diverse perspectives and encourage different views and approaches to problems. The second is creating a supportive communication climate. This encourages people to come forward with their differing ideas. The third is rewarding creativity. Rewards encourage people come forward more often with their ideas. The fourth is fostering collaboration. In this area, it is key for members to overcome communication barriers as those are most commonly the impeders of communication. The fifth is to practice active listening. Instead of thinking of a response while someone is speaking, think about what they’ve said and how it impacts the goals.

b. I am

c. No Author. (2000). Creativity in Small Groups. Retrieved from: <http://www.mhhe.com/socscience/comm/group/students/creativity.htm>

3.

a. The first and most obvious solution is the reproduce the evidence through an experiment. When addressing value, it is very difficult to assess how valuable something is until somebody tries to make money off of it. I’m going to ignore the rest of this and talk a little about Wikipedia. Years ago, Wikipedia garnered a reputation for being an awesome source, but often not having reliable information. To combat this, Wikipedia has created many artificial intelligence systems to troll pages with recent changes. These AI look for changes that didn’t actually do anything, or changes that can be malicious. Within seconds, they revert those changes. In addition to AI, Wikipedia hires on consultants in the form of experts and asks them to read and correct pages pertaining to their fields. Nowadays, Wikipedia maintains a network of experts who go on in their free time and correct mistakes. Since 2010, the amount of mistakes on expert-reviewed pages has gone down to practically zero. In addition, many people volunteer their time and go on to fix issues they find. What does this say about online resources? Through persistence, the resource can become better and better to the point where one can quote it without fear of problems. But what does this say about people? It says that people want to fix mistakes they find. This is the entire idea behind peer-review, which, with globalization, the internet has made possible on a global scale.

b. I am