



PERCEPTIONS CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS TO FACE-TO-FACE AND ONLINE GROUP WORK OF STUDENTS

A.CHETHANA, GRANDHI SAILAJA, BUCHI REDDY CHINTAKINDI

Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Engineering, Ellenki college of Engineering and Technology, patelguda (vi), near BHEL ameenpur (m), Sangareddy Dist. Telangana 502319..

ABSTRACT Effective collaboration in small teams is valued by employers. Group projects can be a valuable experience in academics to apply knowledge, solve problems, and develop teamwork skills. Students frequently encounter group work in academic classes but are often not taught how to facilitate effective group collaboration and left to “figure it out on their own.” Students frequently complain of group work because of bad past experiences. This research reports on two studies. In Study 1, business students (n=120) in a Management Information Systems course worked on a multi-week group project (4-5 students) and reported the challenges they experienced. Study 1 identified the types of problems students self-reported in group work and examined whether face-to-face and online students experienced the same problems. A survey and qualitative analysis were used. Result showed that students identified lack of communication, participation, collaboration, accountability, and interaction as the most common problems experienced. Study 2 (n = 129) attempted to ameliorate the problems by requiring the use of the communication software Slack and to improve accountability by using Google Docs to track responsibilities. The majority of students reported benefits from these tools. The list of the most common problems experienced is differed from study 1, indicating that the tools might have

had a positive impact. The results showed that the proportion of students reporting problems in communication, participation, accountability, and interaction reduced significantly for face-to-face students with these tools but did not reduce for online students.

Keywords: group work, online learning, collaboration, small group communication

INTRODUCTION

Students learn best when they are actively involved in their learning process (Davis, 1993). In both face-to-face and online learning environments, instructors implement a variety of learning strategies to create meaningful learning experiences. One common instructional strategy used is group work. Group work is the collaboration of students working on the same learning goals. Implemented correctly, group work has been found to foster learning (Favor & Kulp, 2015; Kemp & Grieve, 2014; Lowes, 2014), help students apply knowledge (Elgort, Smith, & Toland, 2008), encourage problem-solving skills (Canham, Wiley, & Mayer, 2012; Shimazoe & Aldrich, 2010), acquire greater communication skills (Oakley, Felder, Brent, & Elhadj, 2004), and develop teamwork skills among students (Brutus & Donia, 2010). Group work has been used in both face-to-face and online courses (Bonk, Lee, Liu, & Su, 2007; Ekblaw, 2016). However, implementing group work successfully, especially in online classes,

continues to be a major challenge for instructors and students.

The purpose of this study was to examine students' experiences regarding group work in both face-to-face and online courses. Specifically, this research investigated group work in a Management Information Systems course. The results of this study may help instructors design group work that can increase student learning, success, and satisfaction.

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the challenges that undergraduate students experience with group work in education?
2. Are there any differences in undergraduate students' perceptions of or challenges with group work when comparing face-to-face and online course delivery?
3. What ameliorations might have the potential to overcome the challenges undergraduate students face in group work?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Several studies found that online students dislike group work much more than face-to-face students (Favor & Kulp, 2015; Kemp & Grieve, 2014; Lowes, 2014). One study concluded that in adult learners, the attitude towards online group work influenced by prior negative experiences is unlikely to change regardless of how effective the current instructor or group is (Favor & Harvey, 2016). Roberts and McInnerney (2007) and Ekblaw (2016) summarized seven major challenges that impacted group work in both face-to-face and online environments. These challenges included:

- Student apathy towards group work. Students are not motivated or do not understand the benefits of group work.
- Selecting an appropriate process and the size of the group.

- Lack of group or social skills. Students often do not have the collaboration, management, or leadership skills needed to be an effective member of a group.
- Free riders are group members who do not participate yet receive the same grade.
- Inequality of student abilities within the group.
- Poor distribution or delegation of roles and responsibilities within the group.
- The fair or inequitable assessment of individuals within the groups.

Many of these challenges are interrelated. For example, student apathy can lead to free riding. Lack of group skills can lead to poor distribution of roles (Roberts & McInnerney, 2007). Additionally, Riebe, Girardi, and Whitsed (2016) noted that educators favored teaching content over process and tended to place students in teams with little or no instruction on how to work in teams. This was a major challenge to group work.

While most literature generally agrees on problems that can occur during group work, the solutions often diverge. Roberts and McInnerney (2007) attempted to provide a solution to each of the seven problems. However, some of the solutions may not be feasible such as creating an entirely new course focused on teaching group work skills. Ekblaw (2016) made a distinction between cooperation and collaboration. He defined cooperation as delegating tasks in parallel so that team members can work independently. Furthermore, he defined collaboration as the process of working on the tasks synchronously and collocated, which can be difficult to implement online. Ekblaw suggested that collaboration was more important to a successful group. Lowes (2014) researched online groups and found that

delegating tasks in parallel was more effective than synchronous collaboration of group members.

Students are often most concerned about and motivated by their grade. Fairly assessing group projects has a large impact on students' perceptions of the success or failure of the project (Favor & Harvey, 2016; Roberts & McInnerney, 2007). Baugh (2017) attempted to solve the problem of assessing group projects by tracking student contributions. Students would log their specific work in a database. Then, the instructor assigned grades based 50% on the final group deliverable and 50% on the contribution of the individual student. Baugh (2017) concluded that students liked tracking their contributions and preferred the visible level of accountability afforded by a database. Other researchers highlighted the use of peer evaluations for assessment (Favor & Harvey, 2016; Oakley et al., 2004).

Javadi, Gebauer, and Novotny (2017) used network analysis to compare face-to-face and online groups who used a discussion forum for learning. Their research concluded that online discussions closely resembled face-to-face interactions. Kemp and Grieve (2014) compared face-to-face and online communication in groups that were collaboratively writing. Their study indicated that online students registered more complaints regarding communication and indicated a preference to communicating face-to-face. However, the study also noted that there was no significant difference in academic performance face-to-face and online students, even though the online students complained more.

This research is built on prior research by investigating group work as defined by the following characteristics: small group sizes (4-5 members), collaboration over several weeks, and producing a written

business document. This definition can be generalized to a business context where professional teams collaborate to produce a deliverable such as proposals, recommendations, business decisions, etc.

3. METHODOLOGY

Participants

Two studies were conducted. In both studies, the participants were undergraduate students at a regional university in the southern United States. They were enrolled in a junior-senior level, required Management of Information System course in a college of business with a typical undergraduate age range of approximately 20-30 years old with a few outliers. For Study 1, the survey was sent to 189 students. One hundred twenty students (face-to-face = 52, online = 68) completed the survey. Participants included 72 females (60%) and 48 males (40%). Participant's major included management (22%), general business (21%), finance (17%), accounting (16%), marketing (11%), computer information systems (9%), economics (3%), and business law and ethics (2%). For Study 2, the survey was sent to 152 students. One hundred twenty-nine students (face-to-face = 67, online = 62) completed the survey. Participants included 61 females (47%)

and 68 males (53%). Participant's major included management (21%), finance (19%), marketing (17%), computer information systems (13%), general business (11%), accounting (9%), economics (4%), entrepreneurship (4%), and international business (2%).

Context

As part of the Management of Information System course curriculum, students completed a group project where they acted as an information systems consultant for a fictitious company. The goal of this assignment was for students to experience the analysis and design phases of the software development life cycle process (SDLC) and recommend a solution that

involved an off-the-shelf, information system solution. The SDLC simulation was created by the professors who taught the course. The company had problems associated with growth: more employees than previously experienced, accounting inefficiency, over 90-day aging, errors in manual paper timesheet and payroll processes, desire to expand into new locations, desire to use social media marketing, interoperability problems, etc. The stakeholders, who were actors playing the role of owner, accountant, marketing director, and general manager, answered the following questions in a video. The video format was chosen to simulate a face-to-face meeting with stakeholders.

1. What do you do?
2. Please describe the problems you are facing and the associated business processes.
3. What are the negative impacts of these problems? What are the pains caused by these problems and can you quantify the negative impact?
4. How do you see the process changing if you could have anything you wish?
5. What requirements will your solution need to have? What constraints are you working under that we need to consider?

These videos were hosted on a website <https://www.cis.wtamu.edu/simulation/>.

Students were required to select the predefined interview questions as if they, the consultants, asking the question. The related video would play of the stakeholder answering the question. Students used stakeholder responses to identify problems in business processes, quantify the impacts of those problems, identify system requirements, identify any system or business constraints, and propose an IS solution. Students wrote this content into a 10-14 page proposal.

(2017) concluded that students liked tracking their contributions and preferred the visible level of accountability

afforded by a database. Other researchers highlighted the use of peer evaluations for assessment (Favor & Harvey, 2016; Oakley et al., 2004). Javadi, Gebauer, and Novotny (2017) used network analysis to compare face-to-face and online groups who used a discussion forum for learning. Their research concluded that online discussions closely resembled face-to-face interactions. Kemp and Grieve (2014) compared face-to-face and online communication in groups that were collaboratively writing. Their study indicated that online students registered more complaints regarding communication and indicated a preference to communicating face-to-face. However, the study also noted that there was no significant difference in academic performance face-to-face and online students, even though the online students complained more.

This research is built on prior research by investigating group work as defined by the following characteristics: small group sizes (4-5 members), collaboration over several weeks, and producing a written business document. This definition can be generalized to a business context where professional teams collaborate to produce a deliverable such as proposals, recommendations, business decisions, etc.

3. METHODOLOGY

Participants

Two studies were conducted. In both studies, the participants were undergraduate students at a regional university in the southern United States. They were enrolled in a junior-senior level, required Management of Information System course in a college of business with a typical undergraduate age range of approximately 20-30 years old with a few outliers. For Study 1, the survey was sent to 189 students. One hundred twenty students (face-to-face = 52, online = 68) completed the survey.

Participants included 72 females (60%) and 48 males (40%). Participant’s major included management (22%), general business (21%), finance (17%), accounting (16%), marketing(11%), computer information systems (9%), economics (3%), and business law and ethics (2%). For Study 2, the survey was sent to 152 students. One hundred twenty-nine students (face-to-face = 67, online = 62) completed the survey. Participants included 61 females (47%)and 68 males (53%). Participant’s majorincluded management (21%), finance (19%), marketing (17%), computer information systems (13%), general business (11%),accounting (9%), economics (4%), entrepreneurship (4%), and international business (2%).

Context

As part of the Management of Information System course curriculum, students completed a group project where they acted as an information systems consultant for a fictitious company. The goal of this assignment was for students to experience the analysis and design phases of the software development life cycle process (SDLC) and recommend a solution that involved an off-the-shelf, information system solution. The SDLC simulation was created by the professors who taught the course. The company had problems associated with growth: more employees than previously experienced, accounting inefficiency, over 90-day aging, errors in manual paper timesheet and payroll processes, desire to expand into new locations, desire to use social media marketing, interoperability problems, etc. The stakeholders, who were actors playing the role of owner, accountant, marketing director, and general manager, answered the following questions in a video. The video format was chosen to simulate a face-to-face meeting with stakeholders.

1. What do you do?

2. Please describe the problems you are facing and the associated business processes.
3. What are the negative impacts of these problems? What are the pains caused by these problems and can you quantify the negative impact?
4. How do you see the process changing if you could have anything you wish?
5. What requirements will your solution need to have? What constraints are you working under that we need to consider?

These videos were hosted on a website <https://www.cis.wtamu.edu/simulation/>.

Students were required to select the predefined interview questions as if they, the consultants, asking the question. The related video would play of the stakeholder answering the question. Students used stakeholder responses to identify problems in business processes, quantify the impacts of those problems, identify system requirements, identify any system or business constraints, and propose an IS solution. Students wrote this content into a 10-14 page proposal.that fewer students in Study 2 experienced communication, participation, accountability, and interaction challenges than in Study 1. We attribute this to the use of Slack and Google Docs in Study 2. The statistics are as follows: communication (X-squared = 5.3, df = 1, p- value = 0.01), participation (X-squared = 6.3, df = 1, p-value = 0.006), accountability (X-squared = 9.1, df = 1, p-value = 0.001), and interaction (X-squared = 5.3, df = 1, p-value = 0.01). See Appendix C for reproducible R code and data.

Table 1. Proportion of face-to-face students’ challenges

ProblemExperi enced	%of Studentsin Study1	%of Students inStudy2
------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

Communication	37%	16%*
Participation	35%	13%***
Accountability	33%	9%***
Interaction	31%	12%**
Samplesize	52	67

Note. The data is the proportion of students saying they experienced a particular problem. Test of significant differences comparing Study 1 to Study 2 is * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** p

≤ 0.001 .

Table 2 reports the a two-proportion comparison for online students in Study 1 and Study 2. While a reduction in proportion is observed for some constructs, none of the constructs were significantly different.

Table 2. Proportion of online students' challenges

Problem Experienced	% of Students in Study 1	% of Students in Study 2
Communication	32%	29%
Participation	25%	48%
Accountability	24%	23%
interaction	26%	23%
Samplesize	68	62

Note. No significant differences.

5. DISCUSSION AND LESSONS LEARNED

The purpose of Study 1 was to identify student perspectives, particularly challenges, they encountered with group work. The purpose of Study 2 was to try a treatment that could alleviate the problems experienced by students in group work. The type of group work included 4-5 person groups where students identified two business problems, recommended business solutions to those problems using information systems, and wrote a business proposal.

The main finding of Study 1 was that students considered lack of communication with their group members to be their largest hindrance.

There was no difference between face-to-face and online students. When students complained of lack of communication, they meant not having enough communication with group members, not having enough interactions, initiating communication at the last minute, conducting low quality discussions, experiencing lack or poor generation and evaluation of ideas, and having conflicts with their peers with no resolutions. Students chose texting as their technology for communication, and some students referred to texting as a poor tool for communication.

In some instances, the lack of participation by some group members led to a lack of communication in terms of quantity and quality. Lack of participation is distinguished from lack of initiative as follows: Initiative is defined as taking action independently without being assigned. Participation is being involved in the process regardless of whether the task was assigned by someone else or not. Conflicting schedules was another hindrance students experienced. Some students shared that they were busy with work and family. This impacted the availability and frequency of their communication. Findings also revealed that students experienced more problems during the first phase of the project than in subsequent weeks.

Study 2 attempted to ameliorate the problems experienced by students by requiring the use of Slack to communicate and Google Docs to track responsibilities. The vast majority of online and face-to-face students reported improvements in communication and to group collaboration because of Slack and Google Docs.

Students' report of the most common problems experienced were different than from Study 1. We interpret this observation as the tools having a positive impact such that the problems in Study 1 were reduced in Study 2 and new

problems were exposed in Study 2. We observed the proportion of students reporting problems in communication, participation, accountability, and interaction reduced significantly for face-to-face students using the communication tools but not for online students. Online students, who may need the communication tools more than face-to-face students, did not seem to experience as great an effect even though their perceptions were that the tools were beneficial.

In Study 2, students ranked “lack of time management by myself” and “lack of time management group members” among their top challenges. This observation may mean that the communication tools had positive impacts on some challenges and exposed new weaknesses that future studies can help address.

Changes to future course offerings
Instructors may form group projects with the assumption that students know how to work in groups and do not teach group collaboration (Gueldenzoph Snyder, 2009; Riebe et al., 2016). As a post-reflective activity, we searched the literature for additional solutions to group collaboration challenges. Oakley, Felder, Brent, and Elhajj (2004) recommended using learning activities early in the semester to introduce group work skills before the group project. The three instructors did a similar activity where each group completed an activity on Slack. The purpose of this learning activity was to introduce students to each other and familiarize them with how to use Slack. Research also showed that practice exercises at the beginning of the course could foster group work and communication skills (Ekblaw, 2016; Roberts & McInnerney, 2007). Gueldenzoph Snyder (2009) reviewed business communication literature to identify team building exercises which could be adapted to academic learning.

Ekblaw recommended instructors assign

functionary roles to each team member rather than letting teams figure out what needs to be done by whom. In online classes, Lowes (2014) recommended structuring the group project so that students could work on their parts asynchronously and independently. Students still cooperated but would depend less on synchronous collaboration.

Scarfino and Roever (2009) suggested a card game called Diversity as the activity which can help build communication skills. Gueldenzoph Snyder (2009) outlined a group learning activity as follows. In small groups, ask the students to discuss the pros and cons of group work. Ask students to discuss the purpose of the class project. Ask students to role-play positive collaboration, e.g., active listening, questioning, and restating techniques. Ask students to develop a timeline by reverse engineering a project. Train students to negotiate conflicts by asking students to role-play impartial methods to resolve any problem. This activity can be done with online students via team collaboration software or discussion forums.

6. CONCLUSION

Group projects can be a valuable experience in academics to apply knowledge, solve problems, and develop teamwork skills. These skills are requested by employers. The instructors of this course opine that a subset of College of Business students have not learned how to effectively communicate in groups despite having taken two semesters of English classes and experiencing other group projects in other classes. Many students are not prepared for communicating or collaborating in real-world teams. Students identify lack of communication, participation, collaboration, accountability, and interaction as the most common problems experienced in group work.

We demonstrate that using professional communication tools can have positive

impacts on collaboration. As educators, we have a responsibility and opportunity to help students overcome inter-group communication challenges. Doing so will give students a valuable skill to take into the workforce.

7. REFERENCES

- Baugh, J. M. (2017). Assessment of Group Projects. Proceedings of the EDSIG Conference on Information Systems and Computing Education, v.3 n.4355, Austin, Texas.
- Bonk, C. J., Lee, S.H., Liu, X., & Su, B. (2007). Awareness design in online collaborative learning: A pedagogical perspective. *Advances in Computer-Supported Learning*, 251–273. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-59904-355-5.ch011>
- Canham, M. S., Wiley, J., & Mayer, R. E. (2012). When diversity in training improves dyadic problem solving. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 26(3), 421–430. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1844>
- Davis, B. G. (1993). *Tools for Teaching*. San Francisco: California: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Ekblaw, R. (2016). Effective use of group projects in online learning. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 9(3), 121–128.
- Favor, J. K., & Kulp, A. M. (2015). Academic learning teams in accelerated adult programs: Online and on-campus adult students' perceptions. *Adult Learning*, 20, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1045159515596928>
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Gueldenzoph Snyder, L. (2009). Teaching teams about teamwork: Preparation, practice, and performance review. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 72(1), 74–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569908330372>
- Herrmann, N. (1995). Whole Brain Model. Javadi, E., Gebauer, J., & Novotny, N. (2017). Comparing Student Interaction in Asynchronous Online Discussions and in Face-to-Face Settings. *Information Systems Education Journal*, 15(3), 64–71.
- Kemp, N., & Grieve, R. (2014). Face-to-face or face-to-screen? Undergraduates' opinions and test performance in classroom vs. online learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5(1278), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.0127>.
- Koh, M. H., & Hill, J. R. (2009). Student perceptions of groupwork in an online course: Benefits and challenges. *Journal of Distance Education*, 23(2), 69–92.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Lowes, S. (2014). How Much “Group” is there in Online Group Work? *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 18(1).
- Oakley, B., Felder, R. M., Brent, R., & Elhajj, I. (2004). Turning student groups into effective teams. *Journal of Student Centered Learning*, 2(1), 9–34.
- Riebe, L., Girardi, A., & Whitsed, C. (2016). A systematic literature review of teamwork pedagogy in higher education. *Small Group Research*, 47(6), 619–664. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1046496416665221>
- Roberts, T. S., & McInnerney, J. M. (2007). Seven problems of online group learning (and their solutions). *Educational Technology & Society*, 10(4), 257–268.
- Scarfino, D., & Roever, C. (2009). Team-Building Success: It's in the Cards. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 72(1), 90–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569908330375>.
- Shimazoe, J., & Aldrich, H. (2010). Group work can be gratifying: Understanding and overcoming resistance to cooperative learning. *College Teaching*, 58(1), 52–7.