EXPERTS IN TEAMWORK
GULLFAKS VILLAGE 2010

GROUP 3

Process Report

Elizabeth Kanu

Ingebjørg Johnsen

Kurdistan Chawshin

Tor Arne Buberg

Uwe Werner Helmut Schindler   M*ay3rd, 2010*

Preface

Experts in Teamwork (EiT) is a compulsory course for all Master's degrees and professional studies at NTNU. Students work in groups of five or six from several different disciplines. EiT is organized in to "villages" which consist of up to thirty students. All the faculties offer villages and the students can chose between them. The village is characterized through a broad interdisciplinary topic. At the end of the semester the students should submit two reports, one for the technical part and one for the process part. The objective of Experts in Teamwork is to encourage students to apply their academic learning and develop their teamwork skills. During the work in this course the students have the opportunity to test their ability in working in a team and to improve their cooperation with others. This teamwork enables each student to receive training in the application of their field of expertise in practice, which furthermore leads to an improvement of their own academic skills. All the group members have tried to fulfill their responsibilities in the best way in order to reach the group goal. The group would like to thank the advisers and facilitators from Statoil, the village chief Jon Kleppe, Jan Ivar Jensen and the student assistants, Ida Emilia Sareneva and Daniel Aleksander for the effective help and encouragements.

Contents

1   Introduction

This report presents the group work processes of group three in Gullfaks village. The target of this village is an increased oil recovery with 10 % in the Gullfaks south satellite which is the largest satellite in the Gullfaks main field.

The report starts with different definitions of a group and the most important activities which were done during this work are explained. The results of a LIFO test are shown and the personal opinions about it have been reflected. The group used the Tuckman theory to explain the development of the group while reaching the final goal. The other theory which has been applied in the different stages of the group evolution is the "Ground Rules for Effective Groups" of Schwarz. The cooperation agreement for the group is related to these rules. Different conflicts in the group and the actions which have been implemented to overcome those are discussed with some relevant examples. Some of them are highlighted with personal logs and quotes. The limited use of quotes from personal logs is related to the fact that this tool wasn't so intensively used by the team members.

2   Group

2.1   What is a group?

There are seven most common definitions for word group which are explained below (Johnson, 2006).

-A group is a number of individuals who join together to achieve a goal.

-A group is several individuals who are interdependent in some way.

-A group is a number of individuals who are interacting with one another.

- A group is a social unit consisting of two or more persons who perceive themselves as belonging to a group.

-A group is a collection of individuals who influence interactions and structured by a set of roles and norms.

-A group is a collection of individuals who influence each other.

-A group is a collection of individuals who are trying to satisfy some personal need through their joint association.

Some of these definitions may overlap each other and others are maybe more specific. The groups can be divided in to three types according to Johnson & Johnson (2006):

-A pseudo group can be defined as a group whose members have been assigned to work together but they are not interesting in doing so. They believe they will be evaluated by being ranked from highest performer to the lowest performer. Although members talk to one another, they are competing. They try to hide information, attempt to mislead and confuse and distrust one another. Furthermore, the group does not progress because members have no interest in to the group's future.

-A traditional work group is whose members have accepted to work together and members believe that they will be evaluated as individuals, not as members of the group. The work is structured so that very little joint work is required. They seek one another's information but have no motivation to inform their group mates.

-An effective group is a group whose members commit themselves to increasing their own and other's success. The members are happy for working together. They think that their success at the end is related to every one's effort and work. In this group all the members participate in all of the affairs during work and try to have an influence on the final decisions. The work load is divided between the members in a fair way. All of the group members have one goal and do their best to reach success in the best way.

-A high-performance group has the same characteristics as an effective group. What differentiates a high-performance group from an effective group is the level in which the members commit themselves to one another and the group's success.

2.2   Effective group?

The characteristics for different types of groups were explained in the previous part according to Johnson & Johnson 2006. Considering these definitions group three is most likely an effective group. In this group all the members tried to work in the best way to reach the goal of the group. The work load was divided in a way that all the members were interested in their parts. The group members communicated well with each other and there was a meeting every session to present what has been done and what will be the plan for the next weeks. So the members were more or less aware of the other's contribution and worked hardly to reach success and also the goal of the team, which was in line with the individual goals of the members.

3   Professional skills and behavior

3.1   LIFO

3.1.1   What it is about

Life Orientation Training is an applied behavioral science system that increases individual and organizational productivity. This training begins by identifying the individual's basic orientation to life or personal style. Based on this foundation of self-knowledge, it offers powerful strategies that enable individuals and groups to be more productive in their work. This test is very useful to identify your personal characteristics, abilities and weakness and strength in your personal and social life. All of the group members in the team did this test which is distributed by Barnum Associates in Norway. The members were awarded 18 statements that each had 4 related answers. Different situations were described in the

statements and 4 different LIFO styles were ranked depending on how they fit in with every one's behavior patterns. The behavioral styles under favorable and stressed condition are shown in the table 1.

- Styles	Favorable Conditions (Strength)	Unfavorable Conditions (Strength)
SG Supporting/ Giving-in	Like to be achiever, doing something to benefit people, willing to trust other's statements at face value, make allowances for people and defend their rights.	Willing to assume responsibility and try harder, seek and invite help and guidance, trust and allow others to take charge of needed tasks.
CT Controlling/ Taking-over	Control relationship ,quick to act and express a sense of urgency for others to act now, enjoy challenge of difficult situations, like a fast pace, variety, novelty and new projects.	Take on several challenging situations simultaneously without relying on assistance, respond quickly to problem and difficulties.
CH Conserving/ Holding-on	Rely heavily on data, analysis and logic to make decisions, work methodically and consistently follow procedures and policies, like working with tried and true.	Handle difficult situations methodically and in stages, looking at every aspect, advocate the use of what has worked previously, react calmly and consider objectively the alternatives to resolve the situation.
AD Adapting/ Dealing-away	Use the light touch and personal charm to win people over, sensitive to and aware of others' feelings and what will please them, flexible in finding ways to satisfy other people, relate easily and fit in with all kinds of people , quick to change and adapt to new ideas and ways.	Diplomatic and careful of people's feelings, invite external help and resources in to the problem-solving mix ,eager to try many solutions to solve problem or remove threats.

Tabell 1: Four main behavioral styles of LIFO (Adapted: (Atkins, Katcher, & Dahl, 2004))

3.1.2 LIFO – Result for group members

After the test the group figured out their strength and weaknesses in personal behavior. Each member had one highest and one lowest point in these 4 fields. The field with the highest point represented the most preferred and the lowest the least favored pattern. If one of the fields obtained a value of less than 17 it is a blind spot, meaning that someone uses his/her abilities less than required. However if a field got a higher nominal value of 30 the danger of overusing this behavior is given. The truth of the results could be seen in two examples in the group work. The first one was about structuring the process, here Uwe and Tor Arne took the lead as table 2 shows their results are high in control taking. The second example that could be seen was about the involvement of the different team members into discussions. As not all of the team members are extroverted, they didn't express their opinion all the time or agreed in a quiet way. As the high A/D result of Tor Arne shows he is concerned about the feelings of people, that led to the fact that he tried to involve the introverted team members in the discussions and to hear their opinion.

The results for the group are shown in the table 2:

Group Members	S/G	C/T	C/H	A/D
Elizabeth	31/27	13/13	28/25	18/25
Ingenbørg	24/21	21/18	22/26	23/25
Tore Arne	21/13	27/32	16/28	26/17
Kurdistan	32/24	13/18	21/18	24/30
Uwe	17/13	27/26	25/26	21/25

Tabell 2: Team Results

3.1.3 Personal Reflection about LIFO

➢ Kurdistan

"My behavior style according to the LIFO was Supporting/ Giving-in. As it is shown in the results, I had blind spot in Controlling/Taking-over. I got also high points in Adapting/Dealing-with. According to this test my behavioral strengths are: helpful, cooperative, responsive, trusting and considerate. I found these results very relevant to my

behavior. I normally try to be a helpful person in normal conditions but in unfavorable conditions always try to adapt myself with the new situation. During our group work in EiT , I used these characteristics in many situations. For example I always tried to do my responsibilities in the best way. The other characteristic which was reflected in my communications with the group is trusting. During our meetings, I normally did not talk too much and usually I was listening to the other's opinions and accepted them. After some meetings I figured out it will be much better to express my opinions as well. I was surprised with the blind spot in controlling taking style. I would say I am not using this style as much as supporting giving but I didn't expect it as a blind spot. Meanwhile, the most important result for me is that I have to moderate some of my characteristics and enhance the others in order to have much more effective communication in future."

➢ Elizabeth

"The LIFO test was a great test of our individual strength and weakness. It enabled us to have an understanding of how the blend of our strength and weakness will lead to the success and failure of our project. My greatest strength is support-giving. Not surprised that my blind spot is control-taking because I shy-away from taking initiative and control. Well, delighted to have members of my team who take charge and initiative. With project work apportioned to me, I discovered also that my strength in conserving/holding was at play. I spent days trying to ensure that my work was correct and detailed which in the process slowed down the project. By my behavioural trait, I am unassuming; I observed that my teammates   were not sure if I could come up with something as regard the simulation aspect of our project when I promised to. I eventually came up with simulation results.

I have to work more on my weakness especially on control-taking in order to be more effective in the future."

➢ Tor Arne

"I think it was interesting to see the results of the LIFO-survey. I recognize myself in the results under both favorable and unfavorable conditions. Under favorable conditions I tend to be more laid-back and do what I'm supposed to, without any real hunger for control. Under

pressure of some sort, though, I can change quite drastically into a more controlling, no-nonsense kind of person. I think this change has to do with my background in the military and from playing football. When things go bad on the field I often start to point at others in my team and tell them to what to do, and to keep things simple. Personally I knew before taking the survey that I was that kind a person but it is very interesting to see that it shows so good in the survey as well. It has perhaps made me more aware of who I am, and also showed me that I have some areas that maybe need to be worked on."

➤ Ingebjørg

"The result from the LIFO Test was no big surprise for me. I was under normal condition a blend of all four personalities. This is probably a good assumption regarding my behavior in a group. I like to work systematically and effectively, but I know I don't do that always. I want other people to feel pleased within the group, but I am not afraid of saying my opinion or dealing with a conflict if that is necessary. I can take control in situations as well as taking a passive role. It all depends on the situation. I can be really stubborn in discussion when I feel I am right or have a good point, but I try to be open and listen to other opinions or arguments. The composition of the group does also in some extent affect what role I might take. Under favorable conditions I feel I can work more on taking control in special groups.

Under stressed situations my top score was for CH, and I got least points for CT. Personally I feel that I am more control taking under unfavorable conditions than the test shows.

Taking the LIFO test didn't affect my role or behavior in the group. Neither have I noticed any change in the behavior of the other group members. The reason for that might be because we have worked together as a group for a relatively long time, and everybody has found their place in the group, and we had in advance an idea of what the result for the different group members would be."

➤ Uwe

"The LIFO Test gives first of all a good start to think about the own behaviour in a group and classifies it. Because of the classification the test shows the own strength and points out the danger of over using this strength. Besides the possibility of over using it, it shows the areas of improvement for your own behaviour in group work. I could figure out that my S/G is my

week spot and that I can improve the group work with putting more emphasis on it from my side. The other advantage of doing the LIFO Test is that if you know the areas of strength of your team member it is easier to talk and to motivate them. I tried to overcome my weak spot as our part of simulations was not as far developed as the group wished and as it was in our time schedule. I offered them my help in any point if they needed help and in my opinion that had the effect of motivating the responsible people because they weren't used to it and so could feel that this part was really important for the whole group."

3.2 Academic Skills

The group is composed of 5 students from different faculties with different abilities and fields of study but with the same goal. Because of these interdisciplinary it is important to figure out how the different expertise can contribute to each other to reach the best possible goal, for that everybody highlighted his or her own Knowledge, Skills and Competences.

➢ Kurdistan:

Background: BSc in Geology

Ongoing: MSc in Petroleum Geology

The most important knowledge which was effective in the team work was the geological background. This helped the group in the technical part. She had some basic knowledge in FORTRAN and MATLAB which wasn't used during this work.

➢ Elizabeth:

Back ground: BSc in Chemical Engineering

Ongoing: MSc in Natural Gas Technology

The most effective knowledge was her skill in software programming which was used in the simulation part despite her lack in reservoir engineering.

➢ Tor Arne

Ongoing: MSc in Materials Science

The most important were his group work skills and keeping a good spirit and the competence in his mother tongue Norwegian. It helps while doing research and searching for other information. His Knowledge in Materials didn't show up because of the given task.

➢ Ingebjørg

Ongoing: MSc in Petroeum Engineering

She studies petroleum technology with drilling as study specialization, and therefore has knowledge about wells and how the wells are being drilled. She also could contribute with some explanation of different petroleum parameters and expressions used.

Her positive attitude regarding group work, contributed in making this group work as good as possible.

> ➢ Uwe:

Background: Dipl. Ing.Mechatronik

Ongoing: MSc Project Management

The most important Knowledge is the one about Planning a Project, the skills with which he could contribute to the best performance of the team is the skill to moderate and structure discussions in a group and at last the competence in working with the program Microsoft Word.

4   Experienced based reflections and actions

In the next part different actions and conflicts are described which helped the team to develop through the different stages of group development. Furthermore the influence of the ground rules of Schwartz is elaborated.

4.1   First Day

On the first day of the EIT, the team came together for the first time and different games were played to get to know each other. According to the Tuckman (1965) Model of group development the first stage is the forming stage. The group Task Issues are e.g. to introduce the different group members, that everybody can oriented himself and to include everyone. The different games helped to overcome the challenges at the beginning of group performing. At the beginning the members were introduced to each other with respect to their study area and personal data. After the introduction they did a competence triangle, where everyone presented his/her own competence, personal skills and knowledge. This helped to see the different group members in relation to their expertise and to see where the own place and expertise in the group could be. To get to know the team members better and more personal everybody had to tell a scary story, this helped to break the "ice" even more. After the official part the groups went together to go carting and bowling.

That the described activities and games were very important to overcome the first obstacles of group development which can be seen by an entry of Uwe's personal log:

"As the group sat together for the first time and said "Hello" the atmosphere was kind of cold and closed. And I thought about how this is going to be in the group work, when it is about discussions and finding new ideas."

These were his thoughts at the beginning of the day after the different activities and games he formulated his thought differently.

"Comparing the end of the day to the first minutes, the team members spoke in a different way to each other. The conversation was going on without long breaks and flowing freely. This development was also related to the fact that Tor Arne tried to involve the team members who are not so extrovert like me."

4.2 Second Day

The group started the second day with a much warmer atmosphere. One of the challenges for the group was to decide on the main task which the group supposed to work with. In fact this decision wasn't easy since the group members were from different parts with different interests and abilities. During discussions they tried to respect the members' opinion and consider their expertise and interests. In this stage the main goal was really unclear for the group members so the conflict was inevitable. Finally the group couldn't decide on one task so it was postponed to the next meeting in which it was managed. Using Tuckman theory of group development, it can be seen that the group is between the Norming and Storming stage, because the discussion started but none of the group members wanted to risk a real conflict. Throughout the day two important aspects for that development took place. The first one was about choosing a communication platform and the second one about making a cooperation agreement, whereas the second one was important through out the fact that it fulfils the need for clear rules, which are part of the storming stage.

4.2.1 Communication Platform

One of the most important events was deciding to have a communication platform. Since the group members had experiences from former projects, they decided to make a project page on IT'S Learning and share the information there. This was a big step in the group development because basic information, relevant to the work, can be revealed from all members. Here one of the ground rules of Schwarz," share all relevant information", is applied.

4.2.2 Cooperation Agreement

The second important event was the one about doing a cooperation agreement, because this was the basic point to have a successful group work for the rest of the time. The team was able to work on a common understanding of rules that they wanted to apply and exchange previous experiences regarding group work. As it is shown in the following the basic understanding of the rules that had been applied were good, because it can be seen that even if the team members didn't know the Ground Rules of Schwarz some of them were applied in the Cooperation Agreement.

Ground Rules of Schwarz in the Cooperation Agreement

The ground rules of Schwarz are necessary in the group work in order to have effective decisions and for the contribution of each group member in the different stages of work. A brief explanation of some of these rules and their application in the cooperation agreement are given below:

1. Test assumptions and inferences

According to this rule it is important for the group members to give feedback to each other and test their inferences. This enables the members to get valid information before deciding on assumptions and inferences (Schwarz, 2002). The application of these rules can be found in the cooperation agreement:

"Feedback can be given at any time or while writing the Log Book. Feedback is given professionally and without attacking the person. Every feedback starts with something positive. Before we *punish* someone because he/she didn't stick to the rules we confront him/her with the situation, so that he/she got the possibility to change."

Reflecting personal assumptions in each group will enhance the productivity and prevent misunderstanding of the situations. For example in this group the members always tried to discuss their opinion about each other's work in a direct and respectful way to prevent wrong inferences.

2. Share all relevant information

This rule states that all the members should share the information which are important for group success and affect its productivity. Sharing information ensures that the members have a common base of information. The information for one's preferred position is not supported (Schwarz, 2002). This rule is followed in the group cooperation agreement:

"If we cannot come we write a message on it's learning or to a group member, as soon as we know it. If we have to leave earlier we say it not later than at the beginning of the meeting, but it shouldn't be regular."

It's learning was used as a communication platform for the group members. A project page was made in which any information and challenge was written and discussed.

3. Focus on interests, Not positions

This rule states that each decision for a particular problem should meet every one's interests, desires and concerns in order to have a successful team. This will help the members to be more motivated and concerned about the outcome. To help the group to focus on interests rather than positions, every one's opinion and interest about a situation must be heard (Schwarz, 2002). This is mentioned in the cooperation agreement as it says:

"When we agree upon a meeting we do it with respect to the wishes and schedules of the team members. Everybody's opinion is listened to before we decide upon the result of a discussion."

This rule was applied in the group and definitely had a significant effect on the group's success. In each stage the group tried to arrange a meeting in which every one's idea about a particular situation was heard and final decision was according to the preferences of the members.

4. Jointly design ways to test disagreements and solutions

According to this rule all the members should participate in finding solutions for any problem and every one's opinion should be tested in order to enhance the motivation and commitment. By jointly resolving disagreements, members are more likely to be internally committed to the outcome because they freely agreed to the test (Schwarz, 2002). This rule has been considered in the cooperation agreement, as it states:

"Everybody's opinion is listened to before we decide upon a discussion. If we cannot find a solution on which everybody can agree on, we try to find criteria on which we base the solution. The next step to find a solution is to write down the arguments, if this isn't enough, the decision is found through majority voting."

This rule was followed during group work. The group tried to arrange meetings for each criterion related to either technical or process part and decisions were made jointly.

5. All members are expected to participate in all phases of the process

This ground rule simply means that each member's participation in the work is necessary in order to have an effective group. Since the members are from different fields with various

experiences, contribution of all the members will improve group development (Schwarz, 2002). It is mentioned in the cooperation agreement:

"The *workload* has to be balanced between the team members and if someone needs help or a small push the team members will be there."

It exactly corresponds to the ground rule. During this work every one had her/his responsibility and tried to do that in the best way. The work load was divided according to the members' expertise and interests. For example Kurdistan preferred to work on geological issues which were most relevant to her expertise. This is also true for the others. Since the work was divided between the members, it was not possible to participate in all parts of the tasks. Meanwhile during the weekly meetings the members' works had to be presented to have more understanding of the situation and to discuss about the outcomes.

4.3   Team Work Questionary

After a couple of weeks the assistants gave the group some questions about group work and communication. Although all of the members had more or less the same opinions about the progress in the team and other issues, the questions were a starting point for further discussion. One of these points was about the group's discussion culture which was introduced by Ingebjørg and Tore Arne. The others were about the expression of opinions in the group discussions and the structure in the group.

Ingebjørg said:" I think the discussions in the group are without clear standpoints the members change their opinion too fast maybe to avoid team conflicts."

Tore Arne also confirmed that he had the same sense. After some discussions the group decided to be more precise about the standpoints of the group members at the beginning of each discussion and lay down the behavior of being too tactful while arguing with each other.

One of the questions was if the group members can express their idea in a convenient way or not. Most of the group members believed that they are all satisfied with that but Kurdistan said that she has had problem in expressing her idea. When she was asked for the reason by the other members she said:

"I think it is not a group problem. This is some thing related to my behavior and personality."

She believed that she always prefers to trust the others' ideas and not disagree with them. When the LIFO test was taken, it was easy to relate this characteristic to her behavioral style. She had blind spot in conserving holding. Since it is too important for a group development to have the members' impressions, the group tried to involve her more in the discussions by asking her opinion about different issues. According to one of the ground rules (use a decision-making rule that generates the degree of commitment needed), the cooperation of all of the group members is necessary in the group decision-making processes. So the group tried to encourage Kurdistan to participate in the discussions and express her opinion in order to motivate the group in making effective decisions.

The other discussion was about the structure in the group work.

This concern was expressed by Ingebjørg:

"In my opinion we don't have any structure in our group and I can't see what the others in the group are working or how they contribute to the success of the task".

Because this is an important part of the group development. That everybody can see what the others are doing and how they contribute, it was important to implement actions to react on that problem, even when this problem was not seen in the same way by all group members.

Tor Arne:

"I think we don't have that Problem, because until now we didn't had to work so much in the group and the days were more filled with lectures."

Applying the stages of Tuckman in the group issues, it can clearly be seen that the group is still in the storming stage where Ingebjørg demands for more structural clarification. She tries to know what will be the next step in the group work and which responsibility is given to her.

After discussion the group agreed on putting two regularly meetings in place. That means that the group meets every Wednesday morning and afternoon to talk about what has to be done and all the team members give a short status report. Besides these on the same day it was talked about what has to be done at the moment and how the different group members contributed until now to fulfill the need of Ingebjörg.

The fourth discussion was introduced by one of the student assistants. The question was about the necessity of having a formal group leader. Throughout the group members was the consent that a formal group leader is not needed and not wanted, because of two main points:

Elizabeth:

"I don't think we need a group leader to structure the process, because this is done until now by Uwe and he will for sure do it further. It is in his behavior and it is his expertise."

Uwe:

"I don't think we should announce a group leader because of the matter of shared responsibility. We are all together working on the project and if we don't get someone official staying at the front I think the motivation of the different group members will be higher."

4.4   Conflicts

Besides the actions that were taken to improve the group work and processes some conflicts arrived which contributed also for a higher level of group development and where the implementation of the cooperation agreement can be seen.

In the first conflict which came up after a couple of weeks one of the team members used the rule of the cooperation agreement that feedback can be given when needed. In this specific case he saw that this situation has arrived because otherwise his motivation would drop. This Conflict can also be seen as an example for the openness in the group which leads to the point that the group developed to the stage of norming as personal conflicts arise and are dialed with. The success of the group work is also related to one of the rules of Schwartz, the one of being specific when addressing something.

To a couple of meetings Elizabeth, one of the team mates, came late about one hour. As it was happening more often Uwe was getting annoyed of it and expressed his feelings in one of the introduced meetings.

Uwe: "I recognized that you (Elizabeth) were late (more than the acceptable 5 minutes) in the last couple of meetings. It is hard for me to motivate myself to come punctual and to motivate myself to stand up at 8 o'clock if I got the feeling, that we don't have the same motivation and

that it is not necessary for all the team members to come punctual. If you got problems that are a reason for that just tell me and it is ok but please don't come late without excuse."

Elizabeth: "Ok I didn't know that it annoys you so much and I am sorry about my late comings. I will try to stop it."

After that the situation improved instantly. Uwe was glad that he expressed his worries and Elizabeth improved her behavior and was punctual after that.

The importance of the introduction of the Schwartz rules and the making of the cooperation agreement can be seen in the following conflict.

While making the Report A for Statoil, Elizabeth had to put the different parts of the Report together. While she was doing that she added some graphs to Tor Arne's part. Because she was doing it without any explanation and the other group members didn't know why she was doing it, it had lead to mixed feelings in the group, when the group went through the Report a discussion about it started.

Tor Arne "Why did you implement further graphs?"

Elizabeth "I think it is necessary."

As this start shows this discussion didn't lead to a finish, because the reason was expressed in one word and the meaning of it is not clear enough. So the other team members who were listening tried to influence the discussion that the reasons and the intent behind it came out. After that Elizabeth expressed that she had more information what is important when talking about the performance of an Oil field, because of that expertise she could convince Tor Arne to implement some of the graphs and they agreed on changing some of the others until they were satisfied with the result. The rest of the team was here more in a moderating situation, because this task was related to the knowledge both of the team members gained in the first weeks. As mentioned before here clear aspects of the norming stage can be seen such as open discussion and the fact that the team members listen to each other and the willing to change their opinion throughout the discussion with other members of the group. Beside the rule 4 of Schwartz the rule 7 was also applied in this specific example.

4.5   Last Day before holiday

Good examples about the successful parts in respect to the group work and the process could be seen on the last day before different people in the group were going to holiday. Because of the different activities in the village and through technical problems in the simulation the work was delayed and the planning for the Part B of the work was necessary. As written about it before, in order to solve the problem of structuring and information the morning meeting was introduced. The first example was the one about structuring the work for Part B. Here Uwe took the control taking part and structured the process, after that all the team members worked together to specify the different parts into working packages and put them in an order and divide the work with respect to the different expertise in the group.

The other example was about the programming part of the simulation. Because of the lack of expertise in this field external help was needed as the first try to gain enough knowledge on the first day wasn't successful. Here Elizabeth and Tor Arne expressed their problems with their task and the team helped to figure out different possible solutions for the problem.

Here Kurdistan was the right person, because of here supportive character and the connection to someone with knowledge in that field she automatically and directly offered her help which was happily accepted. One more time the Schwartz rule 2 was an important success factor to overcome this problem. Furthermore it highlights the openness in the team to talk about problems. This is one aspects of the performing stage, as there is creativity and a lot of support between the different group members to achieve a high productivity and solve the problem.

Unfortunately the results at the end of the day weren't pleasant. So an emergency meeting was held. Because three of the group members would be away for two weeks the work load of the programming part had to be done by one of the others and it was clearly defined what we wanted to have achieved after the two weeks. What you can see here from a group development side is that the level of trust was high at this time, because if the work wouldn't be done the group would be in a big trouble.

4.6   First Day after Holiday

After the holiday the first meeting with the whole group was important to motivate for the rest of the process, this was related to the fact that a big step was achieved in the programming

part. So the trust of the different group members had in each other was fulfilled and led to an even stronger connection in the group.

On the same day the team had to fill out the same questions about the group performance as a couple of weeks before, here different aspects could be seen. The first one was that the introduced actions to improve the communication helped. The question about the communication was answered from Kurdistan with a 5 (highest score), compared to the weeks before were it was answered with a (3).

The questions about the structure and the one of being aware of the different tasks were also answered with a better result than before.

5   Reflection about the Team Development

As the report shows the team developed through the first three stages without big Problems, but it didn't become a high performing team. To find the reasons for that the team discussed this topic at the end of the course and several facts were figured as hurdles on the way to the performing stage.

The first factor is more related to the circumstances of the work, as it is, the time. Since most of the time during the work was taken by the lectures, the process was disturbed and the group couldn't spend enough time together

The other factors are more related to the actual process of the group work.

The second factor was the different opinion about the level of planning and specifying the achievements of every person. Here for some of the group members the planning was too less as they wished a more detailed plan to motivate and control themselves.

The third factor was about the implementation of the regular group meetings. This was done to the purpose of seeing how the different members contribute to the achievement of the final goal and to get a feeling for the pressure the team had in relation to the schedule. The Problem was that the meetings were hold regular before the eastern holiday, but not afterwards.

The fourth factor was about the feedback in the group. The cooperation agreement states that feedback can be given at any time when it is needed, but that is too less. The reason therefore is that a voluntary feedback is only given if an annoying or disturbing topic arises, so the small problems or frictions in the group stay under the surface.

Those factors and the delay, because of technical difficulties, led to a motivational drop and a no longer highly motivating and encouraging atmosphere after the holiday. So the group didn't develop to the performing stage, with a more strict way in dealing with the implemented actions after the holiday this step could have been achieved. However the mood of the group during the whole process was good and the team members had fun while working which each other.

6   Conclusion

As the report shows the group developed through the different steps of group performance, for the different team members it was a good experience to be part of the process and to be aware of it. This experience gave everyone new insight and knowledge in that field which can be used as a guideline and expertise in future group work. As the personal reflections of the LIFO-Test showed this test helped to become clear about the own function in the group and to give a hint where to improve the own behavior in the group work. To sum it up it was a good experience for the whole team and improved the knowledge and the skills in group work.

Tabells

Bibliography

Atkins, P. S., Katcher, P. A., & Dahl, E. (2004). *Productivity Workbook.* Los Angeles: Business Consultants Network.

Johnson, & Johnson. (2006). Joining together - groupt theory and group skills.

Schwarz. (2002). The skilled facilitator - Ground Rules for effective Groups.

Tuckman, B. (1965). Development Sequence in small Groups. *Psychological Bulletin* , 384-399.