Organisational Behaviour and Human Management

Hamish Sams

December 2, 2017

Abstract

This report talks about the behaviour and interactions between individuals in university SHIPs groups and possible causes for the errors our group made and where this could be improved.

1 Groups

1.1 Tuckman B.W. process

Bruce Tuckman is the inventor (Discoverer) of the process that every group will go through the forming, storming, norming and performing. Every group must go though forming otherwise the group wouldn't exist, some groups may have already existed before hand and so forming isn't repeated but Tuckman states that newly formed groups tend to perform badly compared to those who have formed a while ago. Our group initially formed over a year ago but with infrequent meetings and contact the forming stage never really completed and so could be classed as newly formed(R. Brown).It is also stated that groups with larger differences (such as racial teachings) will take longer to form together to work well.

1.2 Group structure

The Belbin group test wasn't taken to find out if our group would work well but from working in the group it is apparent that two members are almost identical in function which isn't good for a small group. These two members are both of Chinese ethnicity and so maybe it's ethnic teachings that make them similar or also could be the fact that the two members have created a sub group in the already small group, (Could this be an out group?). As the two members are both of the same ethnicity it would appear they aren't the minority but could still be seen as the minority of the UK(ASCH). Is it possible that this feeling of being the minority causes them to be quiet? While working in the group it was apparent that social loafing was taking place reducing the output of the group drastically, this could be caused by Tuckmans forming stage hadn't been completed yet meaning the sub groups had more effect than they should. The social loafing could also certainly be based on the whole sheep and shepherd philosophy of if nobody else has done anything then i won't either causing no work to be done at all. Unfortunately little quantitative information is available on China and Egypt (Group ethnicities) possibly due to countries strict leadership.

2 Motivation

From the off it's very apparent that there was a lack of motivation in the group to work together (Cultural or racial issues?). It is seen that until recently where jobs have become specific and alienating there has been no issue with motivation, could this be down to the job type such as specific compared to open or is it down to time differences where previously it was work or you starve compared to nowadays it's work or self actualization (Maslow's Heirachy). Each member of our group was given an open job which should increase motivation as there is freedom of what to do but still a lack of motivation. Unfortunately almost everything on motivation is tested within the US and Europe meaning do these still stand for the rest of the world. As ships is only self actualization based do we need to focus more on this to motivate people now as it's hard to get recognition or personal growth from it, does this reduce motivation? The cultural differences in our group may mean different things motivate us (McClelland). In ships unfortunately there are

little if any intermittent rewards to increase the "addictivity" of the task. Expectancy theory tells us that the higher the probability of something good happening, the larger the drive to do work, with ships being worth a small amount of the degree it is unlikely this gives students a large drive to do work. From the beginning there has been a goal set, that being we must present a solution to our company, this in itself isn't specific though meaning this has little effect on drive, specific individual tasks were set but with no consequence and so they were ignored, a larger reward or consequence would possibly have increased drive.

3   Cultural differences

This is certainly a huge role in a group with such a diverse peoples in a tiny group. As most of the group are Chinese that is what i will base the differences with. It can be seen that rote learning is the norm in China and that is certainly backed up by the way people in our group acted, they struggled with coming up with ideas and relied more on others to do that for them, this can be annoying and irritating to the others in the group who then have to pick up the work they refuse to do. Because they rote learn they struggle to answer questions and understand the topics which can cause large issues in group presentations where they prefer blocks of text compared to explaining data. From the way the asians acted in our group it appeared like they didn't care much for what we were doing and would simply prefer to copy and paste data than make their own and appeared less bothered with the gain of good grades (is this a money thing?). These people didn't like to take control in the group, they much preferred to sit quiet and wait for a specific job that they would be told to do and when for.

4   Stress & communications

Whenever there is work to be done there is going to be stress involved, while ships was being fulfilled there were 5 other reports in the making meaning stress was high, in terms of the inverted u diagram stress was certainly in the danger zone as people in the group were becoming very idle and tired. It was apparent in our group that selective listening was happening whether that was down to language barrier or complete lack of drive but another issue with the cultural differences is the complete lack of facial and vocal expression, this is probably down to the upbringing and lack of time spent in the UK before study.

5   Conclusion

In conclusion our group stuggled with communication and the cultural differences in our group made it hard to negotiate solutions and explain our side of the story. More reasons to succeed (motivation) would greatly increase the production of the group assuming that the communications cleared up.