**Collaborative and Interpersonal Communications FAC125**

**Individual In-Class Assignment**

**Group Dynamics – 12 Angry Men**

The classic 1957 movie, *12 Angry Men*, is a film about 12 jurors deciding on the fate of a murder suspect. Although the movie is quite old and is in black-and-white, it illustrates a number of principles in group dynamics such as leadership, consensus building, conflict, etc.

For this in-class assignment, please write down your responses to the six sections below with a few sentences in each. Your response to each section is worth a maximum of 20 points for a total of 120 points. Your responses will be graded by the instructor in terms of relevant to group collaboration and dynamics you’ve learned in class. **Please note that answering with less than three sentences for each question will generally get you less than 20 points.**

**Jury Deliberation Room**

Meek Bank Clerk

Elderly Gent

Architect

Jury Foreman

Table

Immigrant

Racist

Ad Exec

Baseball Fan

Owns messenger service

Stock Broker

Grew up in slum

House Painter

**When completing these sections, please use jury number (e.g. #1, #5, etc.) to identify the people involved.**

1. Please describe the phenomenon of groupthink in this group and offer evidences of groupthink.

At the start of the deliberations many of the members were afflicted by group think. Juror 2 is the worst example of this. When asked Juror 2 didn’t really state a valid reason he believed the child was guilty, he just felt that way because they didn’t disprove his guilt. The other members were affected by it but had reasons for their ruling that are understandable until looked into.

1. Please identify two different conflicts among the jurors, determine the types of conflicts they are (pseudo, simple, or ego) and describe how they resolved their conflicts.

When the Jurors recast a second vote with #8 abstaining juror #3 started to berate #5 because he believed #5 voted not guilty because he grew up in similar conditions to the boy. This was a bit of pseudo conflict, #3 was mistaken, #5 had voted guilty and it was in fact #9 who had voted not guilty.

After everyone had been convinced of the boy’s innocence except for #3 he caused all sorts of ruckus, this was an ego conflict. He was so sure of himself, and he wanted the boy to be guilty for his own selfish reasons.

1. Please describe the roles played by three different jurors in the group. Please refer to Chapter 3 in the textbook to see descriptions of different roles in groups.

#1 was assigned the role of Task Leader and he went about that role very well. He facilitated communication from all members of the jury while doing his best to keep the conflict creators from creating conflict.

#8 ended up taking the role of information seeker, he wasn’t sure of the boy’s innocence, but he wasn’t sure without a doubt of his guilt either. Because of this uncertainty he asked all members to elaborate why they thought the boy was guilty. This elaboration led to more discoveries that weren’t thought of by the defending attorney.

#3 was the prime example of a negative role, he took on the role of Aggressor. #3 was aggressive from the start of the film all the way to the very end. Constantly yelling at people and trying to overpower them until he got to the point where he tried to attack someone.

1. Please identify the leadership styles (authoritarian, democratic, or laissez-faire) of two “leaders” in the group and why you ascribe those styles to them.

#1 and #8 both took to the democratic style of leadership. They both proposed and agreed to act on the vote and neither of them had any qualms with the results.

I didn’t really see any other leaders or leadership positions being taken, #8 tried to take authority and get things over with but he failed.

1. Please describe the process of consensus building within the group to arrive at the final decision.

Well at first everyone but 1 member of the jury agreed that the boy was guilty. Then that one member challenged the beliefs of all the other men by asking them to elaborate and by giving counter points. Next vote there were 2 people who voted not guilty, next vote there were 6 who voted not guilty, up until the last man broke down and said not guilty.

1. How does the group balance structure (Task orientation) and interaction (Process orientation) to produce the best solution?

They give everyone a turn to speak while suppressing those who speak too much, until it is their turn, then they listen. This gives everyone time to say what they want.

When things were getting too heated, they called for a break and let everyone cool off for a few minutes. Overall, I feel like they balanced these two dynamics very well.