

Term Project: Campus Security

The Undercover Blondes

Melissa Jones, Ali Smith, Alena Van Allen, Gannon Veh, & Jason Young

Pittsburg State University

Small Group Communication

April 29, 2014

Term Project: Campus Security

Campus Security Proposal**Major Problem Areas & Causes**

Through our extensive research and talking to members of the faculty and police force, we have decided to do our proposal over the inadequate number of the police officers on our campus police force. According to Director Mike McCracken, our police force hasn't grown at all since he joined the campus police in 1997, even though our school now covers a large area and accommodates more students. Inadequate security makes Pittsburg State University at risk for more crimes because the police force only has 12 officers to watch over the thousands of Pitt State students.

The biggest problem we've come across is the inadequate numbers of officers on the force compared to the number of students at Pittsburg State and the visibility of the officers. Campus police are responsible for watching tailgating during football games and watching over the campus. With such a big increase in the student population it would be hard to watch over the crowds tailgating outside the football stadium and watching the campus at the same time properly. Also the fact that the campus police don't have a bike patrol anymore also adds to the problem. This makes visibility limited for the police officers because being restricted to the street in their cars; you can basically only see the outside of the masses of the crowd from the street, not really inside.

Building access is another possible hazard for the officers, because the buildings are basically open until late at night with minimal people watching them. Someone could easily walk into buildings before the building closes and walk out with something they wanted. As the

building are supposed to be closed at 10:00 p.m. but our group stayed in Grubbs hall until 10:40 p.m. the night before our presentation without any distraction from any overseer of the building. This could possibly hurt PSU in more ways than one. Security cameras are being used by the police force, but mostly they help solve crimes that have already occurred, not prevent them. For example, Officer McCracken said they usually only check the cameras when there's a reported problem such as bag theft or car accident.

Areas for Improvement

There are several ways that Pittsburg State University could improve or add to the security on campus. With enrollment on the rise it is important for parents and students alike to feel safe while they are at school. It is also in PSU's best interest to address a problem before it becomes one. Meaning that due to the increase in student population and continued growth it is reasonable to conclude we need more officers. According to McCracken the University has not added any officers to the force in seventeen years. Visibility of more officers on campus would help students feel safer. It is more secure to have a living breathing person who can watch and observe, deter, gather information, and act immediately if necessary.

On the other hand building access not being restricted does not fall too far under importance on the need for adding more security to campus. The reason for this is because it is something we currently do not have. Anyone is able to enter into any building they want on campus, and the buildings are not locked until ten o'clock at night. Adding a key card access to enter would keep a log of anyone who enters into the building as well as keep out anyone who may be there to cause harm or steal from the University.

Security cameras are spread out over the campus and support the university police in solving crimes. According to McCracken forty cameras were put in initially in 2011. The University had cameras set up before that but they were not coordinated into a system. They have slowly kept putting in more security cameras on campus and now there are about 80-90. McCracken said he believes you can never have enough security cameras and they have helped in multiple ways. The cameras help students and staff feel safer and help the environment at PSU stay safe. The security cameras on campus have also helped resolve multiple crimes like hit and run accidents along with the theft of books and backpacks. Recently there was a student hit on a bicycle and the camera aided in solving what actually happened and who was at fault. The cameras also help rule out certain things that happen and/or can help confirm people's stories or confirm that something different happened than what was said. The cameras have helped clear things up between what people have said and what actually happened. It is important to note that not as much damage has been done in the residence halls since the cameras have been put in. This is another factor that led to further research on security cameras, is it the camera itself? Or is it just the fact that when students think they are being monitored it deters them from crime. McCracken expressed that manpower and equipment is what the force is lacking.

Possible Solutions

Key Card Access

Since keys are the most common items found in the lost and found at the police department at Pittsburg State, we thought about adding a card key system to help reduce the number of keys lost. Not only reduce the number of lost keys but also ensure more security. After reading about Arizona State's Security system the Integrated System for ASU Access

Control (ISAAC) is completely remote controlled. With this system the student and faculty ID cards serve as the key to what building they need to have access too. Records are automatically maintained on who has accessed which doors, and when. Doors can be locked and unlocked remotely, on a predetermined schedule or on demand. You can add secondary identifiers to the ID Card, such as PINs or biometrics, to virtually guarantee that only authorized users will be able to open a door or access an area.

Installation costs for door access control vary depending on the type of door hardware used and the number of doors being installed. Costs range from \$1,500 to \$2,500 per door for installations of 8+ doors. If you are installing controls on only one door in an area that does not already have electronic access control, cost may be higher than \$2,500 for that door -- there are some components that are normally shared by many doors, making the cost per door less. Costs will be higher if you need to include biometric readers for added security.

"Affiliate" ID Cards can be issued to individual contractors or other affiliates under the responsibility of a contracting or sponsoring department. Special arrangements for sponsorship and card services must be made in advance. If it is not practical to issue cards because of variable work forces or because the access need is of short duration and temporary, segment managers may obtain generic "contractor" cards. A contractor card has no picture and no individual ID printed on the front. The segment manager must formally agree to maintain control of the cards and be able to say which person has a given card at any point in time. Departments are charged \$15 each for contractor cards.

Security Cameras

The cost for video security cameras is highly dependent on the type of security system that you elect to install and on whether you can share an existing network and video recording system. The basic infrastructure to support Pittsburg State security cameras, network and servers, cost in the neighborhood of \$15,000 to \$20,000. Once that infrastructure is in place, cameras that can use it can be installed for \$1,500 to \$2,800 each. Cameras price range can vary from \$100 to \$500.

Increase Number of Officers

After talking to Mike McCracken of PSU campus police one thing he wanted to see was to increase manpower on the force. According to Indeed.com the average campus police officer in the United States earns an average of \$36,000 a year. The PSU police department is funded by the State of Kansas and McCracken believes that PSU doesn't have the funding to hire more officers.

An additional option is to start an internship program. The mission statement might read, "It is the mission of the Pittsburg Gorilla Officer Internship Program to offer college students, who are interested in a law enforcement career, an enlightening, rewarding, and educational experience." While the purpose statement is "The objective of the program is to provide a meaningful educational and work experience to the selected interns; as well as present an opportunity to assess the police profession first hand." The applicants would have to go through the process of applying for the internship program. It would be up to the head of the program for any specific qualifications. Normal qualifications include must have excellent moral character,

no serious Motor Vehicle Administration Record, no criminal convictions of any kind, must be physically and mentally capable of performing assigned duties.

Implementation Plan

After looking at these solutions and researching campus security and police at other universities, we found the implementation of a Student Patrol Program to be the best option. Student Patrollers would help several problems that Director Mike McCracken outlined as issues with campus security. The visibility of the campus police force is low and this is primarily because of lack of officers and a small amount of police vehicles. The night time security on campus is also lacking, primarily because of the lack of building security. As stated previously, the Pittsburg State University (PSU) Campus Police has very few officers. The force has eight officers, one lieutenant, and two sergeants on the force, plus the Director of Campus Police, Mike McCracken. This is a total of twelve on the force. According to Director McCracken, this number has been the same since he started his work at PSU in 1997. Although the enrollment of students at PSU has increased, the number of officers on the force has not. McCracken believes this is mostly due to funding. They are only funded by the state of Kansas and receive a certain amount each year. They do not control how much they receive. A Student Patrol Program would help this issue by providing man power, something that McCracken has stated is their number one need.

Building Security

PSU Police Officers make nightly rounds through each of the campus buildings on every single floor, twice every night. Considering the amount of buildings on campus and the amount of floors, classrooms, etc. this takes up a tremendous part of their time and could take up to all

night long. Because of this, sometimes they limit the number of times they go through the student housing buildings to the peak nights: Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday. Student patrol would be able to help with this job and create a more complete and secure night patrolling process. This would also create more time for campus police to do other jobs to secure campus. Building patrol and security in the evening and nighttime hours is a major duty of Student Patrollers at universities around the United States. Students patrol in pairs to check locks, buildings, and making sure everything is normal in areas around campus.

Bike Patrol

According to McCracken, the bike patrol helped campus police visibility. The Bicycle Patrol routinely patrolled areas on campus not readily accessible to motor vehicles such as the oval, grassy areas, and special events with congestion of people or motor vehicles. As of now, the Bicycle Patrol at PSU is not in use because of officer disinterest; however, McCracken stated that he would like to get the program back up and running once again. Student Patrol would fix this problem by using the bicycles for transportation during their patrol and would also increase visibility. The Student Patrol Program would be able to use them once they were properly trained. Many other universities use bikes as a way for their student patrollers to get around campus and make their rounds. Bike patrol certification is available in Pittsburg, but it is not required to use the PSU Police Force bikes. Certification courses are available in town and take about 40 hours worth of training according to Director McCracken.

Students Working for Students

Liquor law violations remain the highest crime statistic on the PSU campus, with drug abuse violations and burglary tying for the second highest crime as of 2012 (Annual Security

and Fire Safety Report 2013). This is not surprising on a college campus. Students are going to drink, even if they are underage. It is a cultural norm at universities.

According to Ryan S. Johnson the Security Coordinator of the Division of Public Safety at the University of Illinois, their program of Student Patrol has been highly effective since its beginning in 1984. “We have found over the years we have a very effective program because students want to be with and around other students,” Johnson said. “Students on this campus want to feel safe, but they don’t always want to call on cops to respond (avoid getting busted).” Johnson said that they aren’t concerned whether or not they are intoxicated or underage, but that they don’t actually contact the medical personnel unless they can’t stand, walk, are incoherent, passed out or vomiting. Students contact the student patrol and they feel safe and cared for.

Student Patrol at PSU

Security coordinators and student patrol supervisors from different universities refer to their student patrollers as the “eyes and ears” of the Campus Police. They see and hear what many policemen cannot and report back to the force with information that helps the overall security of their campuses very much. When talking with Director McCracken, he said that he liked the idea for a student patrol program on campus, but there would be a lot of logistics that would go into the creation and implementation of it. Because Director McCracken would be appropriate official to initiate the plan, his opinion is extremely important. Like we have stated before, limited funding is a big issue for the PSU Police force and it keeps them from updating and adding to their security on campus.

For a student patrol program to be implemented at PSU, there would be some expenses that would have to be made for equipment, uniforms, and training for students. Training the

students would take the time of officers on the force and Director McCracken. Right now the PSU Campus Police do not have the funds to pay the student patrol, but it could be a great opportunity for criminal justice majors to have on the job experience as an unpaid internship for academic credit. According to McCracken, criminal justice majors have come to him over the years and have done some job shadowing of PSU Police Officers. An organized internship would not only help the campus police, but it would help PSU students gain experience for the future.

SGC Group Observation

Our group initially had a difficult time deciding on a topic for our project. Issues were chosen and eventually thrown out because we found that they weren't actually problems. We finally sat down as a group and began brainstorming ideas. During this session we found out that our group is terrible at brainstorming. Once someone suggested an idea, it was immediately analyzed by group members. We tried to stop analyzing, but it was a very difficult process for our group. It took us a couple weeks to finally decide on a topic after we interviewed Director McCracken. Our group decision methods took time to produce and implement. The leadership of the group didn't emerge until later as well. Although our group took some time to develop and learn to communicate with each other, we managed to get along and learn more about each other.

Structure

Structure is the idea that any social system's rules, operating procedures, and resources emerge out of the verbal and nonverbal communication between members (Galenes 2013).

According to our book (Galenes 2013), this theory embraces three important assumptions, first one is the behavior of group members is constrained by such things as the general rules of the society in which they live. This first assumption was a big aspect for our group because we

didn't go over ground rules before we started this project and some members got discouraged when someone broke a simple rule that should've been implied that you shouldn't do. The second assumption is that people can choose whether to follow the rules of the group. Since we didn't establish rules from the start the people from different backgrounds obviously thought certain rules were not as important to some as to others. The third assumption is that group creation is a process; the group creates itself initially and also continuously re-creates itself, changing in incremental ways, always in a state of becoming, with communication as the instrument for this creation and constant re-creation (Galenes 2013). This was also an important part of our group. When we first started we all talked as a group, but as time went on we split into smaller groups within the group. Ali and Alena made their own group since they were the two leaders of the group. They would talk about stuff that needed to be done and the deadlines when they needed to be accomplished. Gannon and Jason had a group themselves, since they were both broadcast communication students and tended to bond towards each other because they knew each other before the group.

Also, the book refers to status hierarchy as the relative importance, prestige, and power of a member in a small group (Galenes 2013). Our group definitely had a status hierarchy starting with Ali, she was the clear leader of the group and played the devil's advocate at times. When we first decided we were going to focus on student patrol as a possible solution for inadequate security, she was in her previous group meeting with Gil. When she got back, we informed her that we had a possible solution to our problem. She asked us what it was and then told us convince her on why we should pick this solution. This made her like the king of our group, she had the most power and all final decisions were made through her. Alena was like the queen of

our group, she put all of our stuff online and made it easy to access. The two most organized people emerged as the status leaders of the group and the rest of the group seemed okay to follow the rule of the leaders. Which made them like the princess and princes of the group because they had little power but were still important to the group.

Group Norms & Roles

A norm is an unstated and informal rule of a group that governs the behaviors of its members (Galenes 2013). Norms are rarely written down or even stated by members. They are enforced by subtle means of peer pressure but aren't directly stated. Most norms are enforced by types of nonverbal communication.

Norms were a big part of our group during our time together. Rules were rarely discussed or talked about, they were just implied by moods, facial expressions, and body language. Alena is a great example of this because she did not usually hide what she was feeling, but she never directly stated these feelings either. Her feelings could be directly read through her facial expressions. For example, Alena had a terribly unpleasant facial expression during one of our meetings when Jason arrived twenty minutes late, with no explanation. This was never directly talked about with Jason until later during our member evaluation exercise that we did during class time later that week. Norms and unspoken rules take a while to learn by group members (Paine 2005). The in-class member evaluations helped our group discuss each member and realize others expectations for the group. For both Ali and Alena, being late to group meetings is a big no.

With the development of group rules and norms comes group roles. Many times, like norms, these roles of group members are informal and unspoken as well. Both Alena and Ali are

extremely task-oriented. They help keep the group on task but sometimes they became a little too intense. This is when Melissa comes in. Melissa is the group's tension-reliever. She can sense when things are getting too intense and she comes in and lightens the mood with a funny comment and laugh. She also supports each of the group members, encouraging them and always complimenting their strengths.

Alena established when our group first met that she was good at working Excel and that she would create all of the charts and graphs with the data from our BFCs, VIDs, PMRs, and SYMLOGS. Right away the group could tell that Alena was organized, on top of things, and ready to work. Alena's role in the group became the organizer. She was not only organized herself, but she helped organize the rest of the group as well.

Jason and Gannon are both communication majors with a broadcast emphasis. Because of this and perhaps because they were the only males in the group, they had a sense of comradery toward each other. Their actions, toward the group and what was shown in the VIDs and BFCs were similar to each other as well. They both tended to be quieter when we met with different faculty on campus for our research.

Ali was seen as the leader of the group. Leadership was not evident in the beginning, but Ali later emerged as the leader. The group saw her as assertive and organized. She usually led group discussions and meetings as well as discussions with the different faculty on campus for our research. Ali created the meeting agendas and meeting minutes for every meeting and tried to keep the group up to date on what was going on. Because of this, Ali was shown as the most verbally dominant member in the group through the VIDs which makes sense because of her

role. Alena was close behind Ali in verbal dominance. Alena and Ali usually spoke to each other the most often with information giving and organizing the group.

Cohesiveness

Cohesiveness is a measure of the attraction of the group to its members (and the resistance to leaving it), the sense of team spirit, and the willingness of its members to coordinate their efforts. Compared with members of a low-cohesive group, those in a high-cohesive group will make a point to attend meetings, be satisfied with the group, use "we" rather than "I" in discussions, be cooperative and friendly with each other, and be more effective in achieving the goal they set for themselves. The low-cohesive group will be marked by absenteeism, the growth of cliques and factions, and a sense of frustration at the lack of attainment. (brookes.ac.uk) In general, highly cohesive groups are more productive and open disagreement is more frequent. This is because a climate of trust gives each member the security needed to openly disagree. (Galanes, Adams 2013) Cohesiveness can also be described as a commitment to personal relationships or a commitment to the group's goal. Social cohesiveness from interpersonal attraction and liking produce different results than cohesiveness based on commitment to the task or goal. (Galanes, Adams 2013) For example a socially cohesive group may not achieve anything because they only have the social aspect of the cohesion. The cohesive-performance effect is due primarily to commitment to task rather than interpersonal attraction or group pride. (Mullen, 1994).

There are nine techniques according to Effective Group Discussion to enhance or create group cohesiveness. These are the guidelines we will use to determine if our small group is highly cohesive and task-oriented. Keep in mind that we chose the element we would research

near the beginning of our group formation, so we were able to use these guidelines to strengthen our cohesiveness as well throughout our group life.

1. Help members get to know each other- We started this process from the beginning, however it was not until we were reflecting on our group process that this became apparent. For example, when the group was asked if we got to know each other, we looked around and said no. At that point Melissa shared that she knew Ali was married and Alena was engaged to be married with a custom ring! Jason and Gannon were both in broadcasting. Another group member followed up with yeah and you have three kids. This conversation was the start of us getting to know each other outside of our classroom life.
2. Set clear, achievable group goals.- Goals were set from the formation of our group. Melissa was not at the initial meeting however Ali, who later emerged as the leader, contacted her via email to fill her in on everyone in the group and to exchange contact information. Highly effective and cohesive groups are characterized by the presence of an identifiable task leader. (Keyton, Springstein, 1990) Ali took charge and would advise everyone what they should do by the next meeting.
3. Treat members with care and respect- As a group we were respectful to each other most of the time. There were several ways that we could improve in this area.
4. Develop a group identity, or a rich fantasy life- Undercover blondes became our group identity. Gannon suggested this in class and the rest of us were like are you kidding me? During another class when asked for our group name Gannon shouted, "Undercover Blondes!" As a group we embraced our identity together.
5. Stress teamwork- This is another area we could improve on as a group.
6. Recognize member accomplishments- This was done throughout the group process. For example Alena was always being recognized for her organizational skills as well as the data and graphs she created throughout the life of the group.
7. Reward and celebrate group accomplishments - As a group, once the presentation concluded and we could feel the stress leaving our bodies, each and every member congratulated and told others what a great job they had done.
8. Support both agreement and disagreement- Undercover blondes nailed this recommended guideline.
9. Have Fun! - It did take all the way up to the last minute for all of us to have fun. But we did it.

Highly cohesive groups are often vulnerable to groupthink. Unwise decisions may result when concurrence seeking among members overrides their willingness to express or tolerate deviant points of view and think critically. This would lead to pressure for consensus because members do not want anything to threaten their cohesion. If you were to add the element of time/due date into a highly cohesive group they are all liable to agree with each other because they want to be done on time. Even though our group is cohesive we were not too socially cohesive meaning we did not agree just for the sake of agreeing. Our group displays the cohesive-performance effect because we were committed to the task even though we were on a tight schedule to get everything done. Our group took a while to zone in on the topic we were going to research because members challenged ideas rather than just agreeing on something because we were running out of time.

Our group waited until the last meeting to learn that conflict can produce greater cohesiveness among group members. The reason for this is because when everyone let out their frustrations, concerns, and even explanations as to why some members may need reassurance or support and others just want to do their part and expect everyone else to conform and know what they are thinking. It was helpful to every member in our group, so much so, we made a recommendation to hold a vent session when you are working on a group project. We learned that if we do not do this we are all frustrated and probably not on the same track at the same time. Reflecting back on our presentation our group, "Undercover Blondes," produced an intangible output variable of increased cohesiveness and increased self-confidence.(Galanes, Adams 2013) .

Consensus Decision Making

Consensus decision making is a process used by groups seeking to generate widespread levels of participation and agreement. Inclusive decision making is when as many stakeholders as possible are involved in group discussions (Hartnett). Participatory is when all members have a chance to contribute to the discussion. Collaborative is when the group constructs proposals with input from all interested group members. Any individual authorship of a proposal is subsumed as the group modifies it to include the concerns of all group members. Agreement seeking is when the goal is to generate as much agreement as possible. Regardless of how much agreement is required to finalize a decision, a group using a consensus process makes a concerted attempt to reach full agreement. The last one is Cooperative which participants are encouraged to keep the good of the whole group in mind. Each individual's preferences should be voiced so that the group can incorporate all concerns into an emerging proposal. Individual preferences should not, however, obstructively impede the progress of the group.

We seemed to be more of an agreement seeking group because when we tried to find what are some problems with PSU we would come up with some ideas and we would try to explain why we want to look at this. At the beginning our group had a hard time deciding what problem to solve. Once when we brainstormed ideas, we had a hard time of being convinced about solving that particular issue. When Gannon came up with the idea that the dining hall hours need to be modified he explained why he thought it would be a good topic to talk about. He was seeking agreement that the group would buy in and agree to solve that issue. Then the group started to talk about why this is not really a problem we can do anything about because Sodexo runs the dining hall and not really school ran but it is a service for Pittsburg State. After

some enlightenment, Gannon agreed that the dining hall hours of operation wasn't really the best problem to figure out at the time.

Self-Monitoring

Self-monitoring can be defined as “the extent to which someone pays attention to and controls his or her self-presentation in social situations; high self-monitors are able to assess how others perceive them and adapt their behavior to elicit a desired response” (Galanes & Adams, 2013). Self-monitoring can be classified as either being high or low. High self-monitors tend to be more perceptive of how others receive their behavior and then adjust their behavior to be more acceptable for the situation (Galanes & Adams, 2013). In contrast, low self-monitors are more internally oriented and pay little attention to how their behaviors are being received (Galanes & Adams, 2013). The concept of self-monitoring was first introduced by Mark Snyder in 1974 (Snyder, 1974). Snyder's research looked at self-monitoring and developed an instrument to measure it which started as list of 41 questions but was refined to 25 (Snyder, 1974).

To determine if the members of our group were high or low self-monitors each of us took the 25 question measure developed by Snyder (Appendix A 1). We also each filled out a sociometric person perception questionnaire of the other group members. The sociometric measure was also used by Snyder. A copy of the questions answered by each member, about every other group member, can be seen in Appendix A 2. After scoring the results we were able to develop an understanding about how each of us perceives our self-monitoring activities, as well as how others in the group perceive our self-monitoring activities. The numerical results of the two self-monitoring measures (Appendix A 3) start to define our members. The possible

range of scores for Snyder's Self-Monitoring could be from 0 to 25. For the sociometric measure the results of only the first 6 questions are summed, as per the scoring directions included that Snyder also used. For the sociometric measure the possible scores could range from 0 to 72. We took the numerical results and graphed them (Appendix A 4) to help us get a more in depth understanding.

From the numerical data and charts we were able to elicit several conclusions. From the self-monitoring measure we were able to determine that Melissa and Ali view themselves as acting in ways that indicate a high level of self-monitoring. We also noticed that Alena views herself as doing actions that indicate low self-monitoring. The sociometric measure provides data about how each member is perceived by the other members in relation to self-monitoring activities. This measure also indicated that Ali and Melissa were high self-monitors. However, it also indicated that the group perceives Alena as being a high self-monitor which is in contradiction to how she perceives her own actions. Both measures indicated that Gannon and Jason were somewhat lower self-monitors. Both measures also showed that Gannon and Jason had scores that were fairly close to each other.

Throughout the course of this term project we were able to observe and identify behaviors that relate directly to member's level of self-monitoring. Melissa did a very good job of noticing how members perceived her. She missed one of our meetings because she had to go pick up baseball hats for her son's team because their first game was that evening. We had previously talked in the group about the importance of timeliness. Melissa texted everyone in the group as soon as she knew she would not be able to make it to the meeting, and she explained why. Then when we all met next time she further explained the situation and why she missed

because she wanted to make sure that none of the other members perceived her behavior in a negative way. This highlighted her high self-monitoring tendencies. A key behavior we noticed of Ali is that she was always being perceptive; you could see her analyzing members both when they were talking, and when she was talking. She was able to eloquently word her ideas and criticisms so that they were received openly. These behaviors all point toward high self-monitoring, which is important since Ali was our leader.

Alena generally monitored how she was being perceived very well. However, sometimes Alena's facial expressions were very revealing of how she was thinking. This was especially true when it was an idea she didn't like or thought wasn't good. Her behaviors indicate both high and low self-monitoring which relates to how the two different charts that were previously discussed didn't clearly identify her as being either high or low. Gannon sometimes likes to tell stories or go off on a tangent, which was helpful at times. The behavior we identified of Gannon is that he sometimes wouldn't notice when group members were trying to get back to the topic, which indicates low self-monitoring. Jason tended to be a much quieter member. Members often looked at Jason or asked his opinion in hopes he would contribute ideas or volunteer to do something, but he frequently didn't realize how his behavior was being perceived. This provided evidence of him being a low self-monitor.

Meeting Minutes and Agendas

Ali and Alena both took notes during most meetings and posted them on Canvas for the group later on so that everyone would remember discussions and what needed to be done. Ali usually was the one who typed up the official minutes and posted them for the group. Agendas were not officially made until later in the group's life. The group unofficially talked about what

they would do during the next meeting but it was more disorganized. Alena brought up that we needed to start making official agendas and Ali began making them before meetings. This helped the group stay on track and stay on the same page with one another. Meeting agendas are in Appendix B and meeting minutes are in Appendix C.

Behavioral Function Charts (BFCs)

We utilized BFC's three different times during the course of our project. For each occasion we would have at least two people do a BFC and then average the numbers in an attempt to get the most accurate information. We also figured the totals and percentages for each row and column. In addition we created a simple bar chart for each of the three BFCs to provide a visual representation that is easier to understand at a glance.

For the first BFC Melissa was not present. From reviewing the beginning BFC data and chart (Appendix D 1 & 2) we noticed that Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Opinion Giving comprised 70% of our interactions.

The middle BFC provided a more complete picture since all of the group members were present. From looking at the data and the middle BFC chart (Appendix D 3 & 4) we noticed the occurrences were more spread out among the different functions instead of being so condensed. We did notice that Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Opinion Giving were the main functions and made up 48% of interactions.

For the end BFC all group members were present but our interactions were different. The changes can be seen in the end data and chart (Appendix D 5 & 6). This was one of our final group meetings and interactions were tense. Because of this there was an increase in Tension

Relieving done by Ali and Melissa. This meeting also had our highest amount of Opinion Giving at 26%.

Role Diagrams

From the Behavioral Function Chart (BFC) data we were able to create role diagrams for each group member at the beginning, middle, and end of our term project. These diagrams helped us to visually see what functions different members played as we communicated.

From the beginning set of role diagrams (Appendix E 1) we created we were able to notice several key roles for each person. Ali's main roles were Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Giving. Alena's main roles were Information Giving and Information Seeking. Gannon's Main role was Information Seeking. Jason's main roles were Information Seeking and Opinion Giving.

The middle set of role diagrams (Appendix E 2) proved to be very different from the beginning set. The diagrams for Melissa, Ali, and Alena show a more diverse set of roles are being fulfilled. Two of the most important roles continued to be Information Seeking and Information Giving. Gannon and Jason had a much more limited number of roles. Gannon's key roles were Information Giving and Opinion Giving. Jason's contribution was even more limited and his key role was Opinion Giving.

The end set of role diagrams (Appendix E 3) showed some differences but also similarities to previous role diagrams. Melissa's key role was Information Seeking, which was because she was asking lots of questions to make sure she understood her part. Ali was answering most of the questions which explains why her two largest roles were Information Giving and Opinion Giving. Alena's largest role was Opinion Giving. Gannon's key roles were

Information Giving and Opinion Giving which is the same as his middle role diagram. Jason's key role was Opinion Giving which is also what his key role was in his middle role diagram.

System for the Multiple Level Observation of Groups (SYMLOG)

We developed SYMLOGs on three occasions. The Y axis shows Forward (Task-Oriented) versus Backward (Emotionally Expressive). The X axis shows Negative (Unfriendly) versus Positive (Friendly). The dimension of dominant versus submissive is indicated by the size of the circles, with the larger circle representing a more dominant member. We would each develop our own personal SYMLOG and then compile them. We determined the best way to get compiled SYMLOGs that equally represented the different views of our members was to mathematically average the individual depictions. For the beginning, middle, and end SYMLOGs we created a full grid ranging from -5 to +5 on both the X and Y axis, but we also created a more up close view that has X and Y axis from 0 to +5. We determined this was necessary because they both help make the SYMLOG easier to understand and interpret.

Our beginning SYMLOG numerical data (Appendix F 1) and the resulting bubble chart (Appendix F 2) provide an accurate representation of the initial layout of our group members. Melissa was the most positive or friendly member. Ali was placed as being the most dominant and task-oriented. Alena was the second most dominant. Gannon was more backward and emotionally expressive. Jason was the most submissive member.

The middle SYMLOG numerical data (Appendix F 3) and the resulting bubble chart (Appendix F 4) have some similarities to the beginning SYMLOG, but it also has differences. The key similarity we noticed was the dominant versus submissive aspect. Melissa was viewed as being more forward or task-oriented than in the beginning. Ali had an increase of how positive

or friendly she is. Alena made no notable shifts from the beginning to middle data. Gannon was viewed as being more positive and more emotionally expressive. Jason, however, was viewed as being the most backward or emotionally expressive among our members.

The ending SYMLOG numerical data (Appendix F 5) and the resulting bubble chart (Appendix F 6) provided what we feel to be very representative of our group. The dominant versus submissive element continued to be near the same as both the beginning and middle results. Melissa's positive decreased but her task orientation increased. Ali was viewed as being less friendly than previously. Alena was ranked as less friendly and more task-oriented. Gannon had a slight decrease in how positive he is but a fairly significant increase toward being more task-oriented. Jason had increases in both his task-orientation and how positive he was.

Verbal Interaction Diagrams (VIDs)

The verbal interaction diagrams helped us to be aware of how frequently members were speaking, as well as whom they were speaking to. For the beginning, middle, and end readings we had at least two people do VIDs and then we averaged the numbers together to get the best representation of our interactions. For each of the occasions we did VIDs we totaled the rows and columns and also figured the percentages for the data. We also created two charts for each VID which were a "From" chart that shows who was speaking, and a "To" chart to show whom was being spoken to.

For our beginning VID Melissa was not able to be present. As we looked at the beginning data and charts (Appendix G 1) we were able to identify several factors we thought were important. Ali was speaking more but the input from Alena, Gannon, and Jason was fairly equal. We were also able to identify that 72% of the time if a member was speaking it was directed at

the group. We thought this was a very good thing because it helps keep any group members from feeling excluded.

For the middle VID (Appendix G 2) all members were present. For this occasion Ali was again the person who spoke the most. Melissa, Alena, and Gannon each spoke around the same amount. We did notice that Jason contributed less than the other members. We were able to identify the cause of this as being that he arrived around 20 minutes late to that particular meeting. As we looked at whom was being spoken to we noticed that around half of the time the group was being addressed, and that the other half of the time a certain person was being addressed.

For the ending VID (Appendix G 3) there were some noticeable differences. Since Melissa was asking a lot of questions specific to her part there was a significant increase in the number of times a member spoke directly at her. Even with that being the case, 54% of the time when a member was speaking it was directed at the group as a whole.

Post Meeting Reaction Forms (PMRs)

The post meeting reaction forms provided a helpful way for our group to monitor ourselves. At the end of each meeting we would each fill out a PMR and then before the next meeting the results would be recorded into Excel and averaged. That data would then either be printed out and brought to the meeting, or posted online so all members could see it so we would know how we were progressing.

As we did PMRs we made sure to date each one, and then they would be numbered as they were entered into the computer to help us stay organized and keep track of the data. The PMRs are further sectioned out by each meeting (Appendix H 1). From that data we created

PMR Response Charts (Appendix H 2). We determined it necessary to graph each individual data point because any kind of daily average could conceal important information. Furthermore, each of the eight different components of the PMR needed its own graph because combining them resulted in lines and data points of other components being overlapped.

We determined that the Daily Averages of PMR Data (Appendix H 3) was beneficial for another purpose. We were able to take those numbers and create a Daily Averages Chart (Appendix H 4) and then sort it by the different elements. The key thing we were able to notice from this is that our “Leadership” had a generally increasing trend over the course of our term project. This was something that was not as easily noticed when looking at the charts that displayed each individual data point. As a group we agreed that as we progressed through the project our group’s leadership steadily developed.

As we took a final look at our PMR data we calculated the term project PMR average along with a bar chart (Appendix H 5) that shows this data. This information helped us to identify that leadership was our group’s lowest ranked concept and opportunity to speak was our highest ranked concept.

Considerations for the Future

Towards the end of our group project we spent a couple meetings discussing what we would change or continue doing if our group were to continue. We decided that our members should be more verbal during meetings. Many times members did not discuss their true feelings on ideas or other member’s actions and only showed their feelings through facial expressions. Members relied on non-verbals to relay how they felt. At the beginning of our group project we

never discussed what we expected from all of the group members. Discussing expectations at the beginning would have helped with the issue of being more verbal during group meetings.

We would also pre-plan interviews better so it doesn't take up meeting time. Because during most of our meetings we would call someone to interview and normally they would call saying that they can do it in 30 minutes and for the rest of that meeting we would have to think of questions for the interview and not really concentrating on other things. It did cut up some time to edit on the paper but we pulled together and got through it.

As a group we would set tighter deadlines and check in with members to ensure that they understand what they are to be doing. It is important to have everything done when you tell the group you will have it done, they are counting on you. Not doing this will cause the other members to become frustrated and think you do not care.

As a group we should also be more supportive towards each other, we are teammates and need support until the end. Members do need support but don't want to have someone breathing down their backs the whole time. That would put more pressure on members and may result in them hating each other. Also, you should include a vent day in your group activities because while trying to be supportive you can't always express what someone else has done that upset you. You should schedule time for this in a couple meetings so you're allowed to vent and get it in the past so tension doesn't linger over into other meetings.

We realized that if the group were to continue on we would have to make an effort to have more fun. If we were having fun together we would likely be able to build stronger bonds among the members. In addition, having fun makes projects and group work more enjoyable for

all those involved. At one of our final meetings we did start to relax with each other which resulted in a more “fun” atmosphere.

References:

Annual Security and Fire Safety Report (2013). *Pittsburg State University*. Retrieved April 20, 2014, from <http://www.pittstate.edu/dotAsset/384ef407-c774-44f3-82e6-862cc6f7be27.pdf>

Bike Patrol. (n.d.). *Pittsburg State University*. Retrieved April 18, 2014, from <http://www.pittstate.edu/office/police/bike-patrol.dot>

Galanes, G. J., & Adams, K. (2013). Communication and Group Culture: Tensions, Fantasy, Socialization, Norms, Climate, Communication, Group Culture, and Cohesiveness *Effective*

group discussion: theory and practice (14th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hartnett, T. (n.d.). *The Basics of Consensus Decision-Making*. Consensus Decision-Making:

April 19, 2014 from:

<http://consensusdecisionmaking.org/Articles/Basics%20of%20Consensus%20Decision%20Making.html>

Indeed.com. (2014). Retrieved from:

<http://www.indeed.com/salary?q1=Campus+Police+Officer&l1=>

ISAAC and the ASU ID Card are the Standards. (n.d.). Retrieved from Arizona State University:

<http://cfo.asu.edu/fdm-door-access>

Keyton, J., & Springston, J. (1990). Redefining Cohesiveness in Groups. *Small Group Research*, 21, 234. doi:10.1177/1046496490212006

Mullen, B. (1994). Psychological bulletin. *Psychological bulletin*, 115(2), 210-227.

Our Officers. (n.d.). *Pittsburg State University*. Retrieved April 18, 2014, from

<http://www.pittstate.edu/office/police/our-officers.dot>

Oxford Brookes University homepage - Oxford Brookes University. (2011). Retrieved from

<http://brookes.ac.uk>

Paine E., Richard (2005). *Identifying and Evaluating the “Unwritten Rules” of Competition*.

National Forensic Association Volume 23 (79-88).