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Exploring the Dynamics of Team within group meetings: A Tuckman's Model Analysis of Presentation Preparation

**Introduction**

Teams are more effective than individuals in tackling complex tasks (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). With teams formed towards complex goals, group meetings have played an important role in facilitating discussions for students' group work and have been guiding us through the entire process of preparing and presenting our presentation. Over the course of four meetings, our group has made significant progress corresponding to Tuckman's model and have experienced all 5 stages in the model. In this essay, I will analyze our group's development using Tuckman's model and discuss the impact of communication and active listening on our group. By exploring each stage of the model and reflecting on our experiences, I aim to gain insights into our collaborative structure. Analyzing each part of Tuckman's model in order, I will delve into the stages of forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning. I will provide concise definitions for each stage and support them with examples from our meetings. This analysis will allow us to understand our group's progression and dynamics more comprehensively. A key aspect of our group's development is the role of communication and active listening. I will reflect on how effective communication strategies and attentive listening have influenced our ability to navigate conflicts, establish norms, and foster a collaborative environment during the meetings. In summary, our analysis of Tuckman's model and its application to our group's journey provide valuable insights into our collaborative development. I will examine each stage of the model, reflecting on our meeting experiences and their alignment with the model's framework. Additionally, I will emphasize the impact of communication and active listening on our group's dynamics and achievements. This examination will lead us to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of our communication strategies and the contributions of Tuckman's model to our collective journey.

**Forming Stage**

In Tuckman's model, the forming stage is the initial phase where a group comes together, establishes goals, and familiarizes themselves with one another (Tuckman, 1965). During this stage, our group went through the forming process as we met in the classroom and realized we needed to form a group for the group presentation assignment. To meet the basic requirement of having enough group members, my friend Daniel and I invited Frankie to join us, making us a complete group of three. Being a good team player is influenced by personality traits and contributes to team effectiveness (Driskell, J. E., et al., 2006). So, I approached Frankie with a polite and cautious attitude, aiming to build a positive and respectful environment to contribute to the team. I exchanged contact information, such as WeChat and Instagram, to initiate friendly relationships with my group members and to create a group chat for presentation discussion. In our first meeting, which took place shortly after we formed the group, we collectively defined our common purpose along with clear goals and equally distributed the work (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). Despite feeling nervous and pressured at the beginning of our group work, I actively contributed by sharing my initial ideas, opinions, and expectations regarding the group's activities. By establishing a friendly rapport and setting clear goals, our group successfully navigated the forming stage. This stage allowed us to lay the groundwork for effective collaboration and communication in the subsequent stages of our group work.

**Storming Stage**

During the storming stage, conflicts, disagreements, and power struggles arise as group members assert their individuality and vie for influence within the group (Tuckman, 1965). Reflecting on our group work, we recognized that this stage provided us with an opportunity for growth and development through the resolution of mistakes and conflicts. During our second meeting, as we delved presentation creation work into the different parts assigned to each member during the forming stage, conflicts emerged. I personally encountered a disagreement with Frankie regarding his work, particularly the information he had gathered and the formatting of his work, I doubt on some problems he idented for the video as inappropriate. This led to some heated arguments, with Frankie perceiving me as being too controlling and dictating the group's direction. I believe there was a misunderstanding between us, which left me feeling a bit frustrated and angry because I always prioritize working for the benefit of the team. In response, I explained that my intention was to foster open dialogue and consider each other's opinions for the benefit of the group. To illustrate my point, I gave out reasons why I consider his information inappropriate, provided examples of how we could improve the slide formatting and suggested alternative sources for more reliable information. Throughout this process, Frankie demonstrated active listening and offered constructive feedback with Daniel, which ultimately helped us build cohesion and resolve our disagreements. We reached an agreement on formatting and the information to be included with feedbacks. By successfully addressing conflicts, resolving disagreements, and establishing group norms, we were able to navigate the storming stage and propel ourselves towards the norming stage. This stage brought us closer together as a team, fostering a sense of unity and shared purpose. We learned the importance of effective communication, active listening, solving conflicts, and constructive feedback in promoting cooperation and finding common ground.

**Norming Stage**

The norming stage is characterized by the establishment of norms, shared values, and a sense of cohesion among group members, leading to increased cooperation and a more harmonious working environment (Tuckman, 1965). As our group passing through the storming stage, we gradually transitioned into the norming stage. This became evident during our third meeting when we were nearing completion of the first draft of our presentation. During this stage, we experienced enhanced communication, with open discussions and valuable opinions and suggestions for improving the overall quality of the presentation. While we encountered some disagreements, the development of group norms played a vital role in guiding our interactions. We established a basic norm to clarify expectations on quality of PPT, provide valuable resources for opinions and suggestions, along with foster open communication, which would lead us to peak performance for our group (Rogelberg, 2018). When meeting disagreements, these disagreements were solved effectively by providing supporting evidence for the suggestions (Kozlowski, 2006). For instance, I expressed concerns about some suggestion improvements written by Daniel being unpersuasive and offered some cited resources to support my suggestions for improvement on his work. Both Daniel and Frankie responded positively to these suggestions. For example, I proposed a unified format using Times New Roman font, with a header size of 32 and a text size of 16 for some finished slides. Furthermore, one of Daniel’s suggestions was to drink water before meetings as a way to calm down and reduce nervousness. However, I disagreed with this suggestion as I believe it might not be effective since drinking water can lead to overhydration, discomfort and increased need for bathroom breaks. Instead, I recommended that he consider taking deep breaths as an alternative method to achieve a sense of calmness and relaxation. These suggestions received favorable feedback and agreement from Daniel and Frankie. Throughout this process, our team experienced an increase in trust and support. We found effective solutions, clarified roles, and improved cooperation (Fapohunda & T. M., 2013). These positive developments resulted in a satisfying output for our presentation by the end of the third meeting, with notable improvements. We all embraced the idea of being part of a unified group, where sharing ideas and suggestions were valued and encouraged. Having developed group norms and fostered trust and support, we successfully navigated the norming stage and transitioned into the performing stage. This marked an important milestone in our journey, as we were now well-prepared on our tasks efficiently and achieve our shared goals.

**Performing Stage**

During the performing stage, the group operates at peak effectiveness, demonstrating high productivity and working cohesively towards their shared goals, utilizing the strengths and skills of each member (Tuckman, 1965). In our case, we experienced the performing stage when we completed the creation of our PPT, practiced for the presentation during the fourth meeting, and ultimately delivered the presentation in class. Our fourth meeting took place after the 11th week of the class, during which we had the opportunity to observe other groups' presentations. This allowed us to quickly orient ourselves to the task at hand and collaborate on how we could enhance our own performance. We identified areas in our PPT that required improvement and made appropriate edits to ensure its appropriateness and effectiveness. We dedicated time to practice the presentation, conducting multiple run-throughs. Initially, I felt anxious, nervous, and experienced some difficulty in fluidly expressing myself, leading to moments of stammering during the practice sessions. However, with the support and encouragement of my team members, as well as consistent practice, I gained confidence and demonstrated autonomy during the final practice presentation. The other members of the group also exhibited confidence, which fostered a positive and empowering group dynamic. Finally, during the presentation day, though we were a bit nervous and slightly exceeded the time limit, I was happy and satisfied with our group's performance. We have set our focus on goals and outcomes, prioritizing achieving results and meeting objectives. By leveraging each member's strengths, we successfully delivered a presentation that presents the end of team work. This accomplishment signifies that we have gone through the performing stage and are now moving towards the final adjourning stage.

**Adjourning Stage**

The adjourning stage signifies the culmination of the group's collaboration, during which members take stock of their achievements, recognize personal and collective growth, and ready themselves to move beyond the project or task at hand (Tuckman, 1965). As we have concluded the presentation, we have entered the adjourning stage and automatically disbanded the group. Throughout this process, we have reflected upon both the positives and negatives encountered during the entire journey. I have personally taken the time to reconsider and modify certain references formatting that were brought up during the Q&A session of the presentation. Additionally, I have reflected upon any errors in my choice of words and the pace of my speech during the presentation. Furthermore, I have engaged in a comprehensive evaluation of our collective efforts with my group mates, commending everyone for their contributions and encouraging all of us to derive lessons from this experience in order to produce even better work in the future. Over the course of these four meetings, our group has traversed the stages of Tuckman's model, reflecting upon our achievements, and preparing to disperse. Simultaneously, we have cherished the experiences and relationships we forged throughout the life cycle of our group.

**Listening and Communication**

Active listening in group meetings fosters effective collaboration (Kabat-Zinn, 2015). Upon reflecting on all our meetings, we recognized the paramount importance of communication and active listening within our group and how these elements significantly contributed to our overall effectiveness. Opting for face-to-face meetings proved to be a pivotal decision, greatly enhancing our work processes and communication. The face-to-face interaction allowed us to observe each other's reactions and body movements, ensuring that we were attentive and actively engaged in the discussions. Furthermore, being able to see each other's facial expressions enabled us to gauge emotions and make appropriate adjustments to our wording when necessary. As we progressed from the forming stage to the norming stage, we successfully established a friendly rapport among group members and set norms for respectful communication. These norms played a vital role in facilitating effective communication during our last two meetings, where we finalized our work . When one of us spoke, the rest of the group demonstrated utmost respect for the speaker, attentively listening and providing suggestions supported by evidence once the speaker concluded. This collaborative approach fostered a positive and inclusive environment, ensuring that everyone's input was valued and considered. Moreover, our effective communication extended beyond just our meetings. Whenever we encountered difficulties or had questions regarding our work processes, we utilized group chats to seek assistance. I recall a specific instance when I was struggling to find different sources and reached out to Daniel and Frankie for help. They promptly replied within 10 minutes, offering suggestions and better sources, which proved immensely helpful. This exemplified how our group chats functioned as smaller meetings, providing timely and valuable support. The prompt responses from group members enabled us to swiftly overcome any obstacles we encountered. In summary, our experience during meetings highlighted the pivotal role of effective communication and active listening within our group (Hoevemeyer, 1993). Through our choice of face-to-face meetings and the establishment of norms for respectful communication, we created an environment where ideas flowed freely, and everyone felt heard and respected. Additionally, our efficient use of group chats for problem-solving further enhanced our overall effectiveness as a group. The combination of face-to-face interactions and effective digital communication channels allowed us to collaborate seamlessly and achieve our shared goals.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the detailed reflection on my group work journey, informed by Tuckman's model, has provided valuable insights into the dynamics and challenges we encountered as a team. By applying this model to our experiences, we gained a deeper understanding of the five stages of group development: forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning. Through active listening, constructive feedback, and facilitated discussions, we quickly established familiarity during the forming stage. In the storming stage, we effectively addressed conflicts with having opinions with supporting evidence and found common ground, leading to shared solutions with credible resource. This set the foundation for a harmonious working environment during the norming stage, where clear norms, shared values, and a supportive team environment were established. As we progressed, Tuckman's model continued to guide us. It enabled our smooth transition into the performing stage, where we successfully executed our presentation and achieved our goals. Which finally led us to the final adjourning stage with a successful closing. The model served as a roadmap, allowing us to navigate difficulties and work together towards success. Overall, our experiences underscore the importance of understanding and managing group dynamics. Tuckman's model provided us with a framework that promoted collaboration, cohesion, and effective communication. By following this model, we were able to foster a productive team environment and achieve closure as we concluded our group work journey.
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**Appendix: Records of The Meetings**

**Group Meeting Record 1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| POINTS TO ADDRESS | STUDENT RESPONSE |
| 1. DATE OF MEETING AND LOCATION (FACE-TO-FACE OR VIRTUAL, PLEASE STATE). | Meeting 1  Date: 2024/2/21  Location: Library 1st Floor Discussion Area  Mode: Face to Face |
| 1. AGREED TIME OF MEETING AND THE TIME MEETING ACTUALLY COMMENCED | Agreed Time: 2024/2/21 13:30 -14:30  Actually Commenced: 2024/2/21 13:25 |
| 1. DESCRIBE BRIEFLY WHAT YOU COVERED IN THE MEETING. | We decided the video that will be used in the presentation.  We have also checked the contents of the video and separated work distribution for the presentation of the video |
| 1. WHAT WERE THE OUTCOMES FROM THE MEETING? | We decided on the video to be used in the presentation.  Video link: https://youtu.be/8sgLgKUHjZI?si=\_xOmPgCLxpHgHc-9  We have chosen on a template and division of labour for the PPT.  PPT Link:  https://connectpolyu-my.sharepoint.com/:p:/g/  personal/22101071d\_connect\_polyu\_hk/ESdeaOBOqRZAvH2hlpJoExkBL2Cm-ciPddJsJlGGWjCOMg?e=N2tlnJ |
| 1. HOW MUCH DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THE MEETING? – GIVE DETAILS. | I am the person that chose the format and template of our PPT and distributed the work for our group. Also, I participated with Daniel on commenting the videos Frankie had chosen and also provided some videos for choosing. |
| 1. HOW MUCH DID THE OTHER MEMBERS CONTRIBUTE TO THE MEETING? – GIVE DETAILS. | Frankie: Given a list videos and analysis their appropriacy for assessment. Participate in visual aid (PowerPoint) creating.  Daniel: Commenting and advising different videos and listed out the pros and cons of different videos that helped choosing. Also, he has participated in PPT format commenting and work distribution. |
| 1. DID YOU EXPERIENCE ANY PROBLEMS OR DIFFICULTIES? IF YES WHAT WHERE THEY AND WERE THEY RESOLVED? | Yes, we had a little difficulty on deciding which video to choose and had a little argument. We solved this problem by discussing the pros and cons of the video, and picked out some video that didn’t meet the 5-min requirements. We found the best one by choosing the one we think fits the best and fulfills all requirements needed. Also, we weren’t aware of impatience that can lead to premature decision-making by taking break, leading to some of the work been decided too early and found out later that wasn’t appropriate. |
| 1. DO YOU KNOW WHAT YOU HAVE TO DO BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING? IF YES, DESCRIBE TASKS TO BE COMPLETED, IF NOT, DESCRIBE WHY YOU ARE UNCLEAR? | Yes, the next meeting we will be in the process of the presentation, and we will have a discussion on changes for the information and work we have right before the next meeting to work towards the end of ppt creating |
| 1. DID YOU AGREE ON NEXT MEETING DATE IF NO, WHY NOT? IF YES, WHEN AND LOCATION. | Yes  2024/3/6 Library 1st floor discussion Area  13:30 p.m. |
| 1. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD AT THIS POINT? FOR EXAMPLE, IF IT WAS NOT A PHYSICAL MEETING, HOW WELL DID THE MEETING FUNCTION, IN YOUR OPINION? WOULD FACE-TO-FACE HAVE BEEN BETTER FOR THIS PARTICULAR MEETING? | We have a face-to-face meeting, and I would say it is a successful one. Because in a virtual meeting if the camera of a teammate is off, I couldn’t tell if he or she can really understand or listened to what I have said.  While under a face-to-face meeting, we can see body movements and faces when we are talking to check whether each other agrees and we know that they can listen to what we have said.  So we decided to have the rest of our meetings as face-to-face mode to keep effective communication. |

**Group or team process review checklist from exhibit 8.4**

Are we reviewing our group/team progress regularly and asking questions if the group/team appears to be stuck or off-track? √

Are we encouraging everyone to participate according to agreed guidelines by discussing how much talking is appropriate giving constructive feedback to overtalkative or quiet members using methods to structure the discussion to involve everyone such as brainstorming and round Robin reporting? √

Are we discussing the need for the group/team to agree on limits, the value of balanced participation and focused, relevant discussion? √

Are we politely challenging opinions, such as by asking for supporting evidence? √

Are we encouraging the collection of relevant data before decisions are made too hastily? √

Are we aware of impatience that can lead to premature decision-making by taking breaks; agreeing on the decision-making process; monitoring the steps and reviewing as necessary?

Are we checking perceptions of other people’s motives by: describe and listening actively, and not blaming; giving all members attention and respect; helping members to express what is important to them? √

**Group Meeting Record 2:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| POINTS TO ADDRESS | STUDENT RESPONSE |
| 1. DATE OF MEETING AND LOCATION (FACE-TO-FACE OR VIRTUAL, PLEASE STATE). | Meeting 2  Date:2024/3/6  Location: Library 1st floor discussion area  Mode: Face to Face |
| 1. AGREED TIME OF MEETING AND THE TIME MEETING ACTUALLY COMMENCED | Agreed time: 3/6 13：30 -14：30  Actual Meeting Time: 3/6 13：30-14：30 |
| 1. DESCRIBE BRIEFLY WHAT YOU COVERED IN THE MEETING. | In this meeting, we standardised formatting of PowerPoint, and we mainly carried out detailed discussion and modification of the content of the PowerPoint, asked others for improvement ideas for our part of the work, and suggested modifications to the content of the PowerPoint completed by others. Apart from that, we also searched for the required information and sources on the internet for citing. |
| 1. WHAT WERE THE OUTCOMES FROM THE MEETING? | Revising the PowerPoint was a major part of this meeting.  PPT LINK:  https://connectpolyu-my.sharepoint.com/:p:/g/personal/22101071d\_connect\_polyu\_hk/ESdeaOBOqRZAvH2hlpJoExkBL2Cm-ciPddJsJlGGWjCOMg?e=N2tlnJ  Looking for a small selection of citations：  Allen, J. A., Lehmann‐Willenbrock, N., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2018). Let's get this meeting started: Meeting lateness and actual meeting outcomes. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39(8), 1008-1021.  Tuckman’s model for citation:  Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. Psychological bulletin, 63(6), 384. |
| 1. HOW MUCH DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THE MEETING? – GIVE DETAILS. | In this meeting, I gave suggestions and helped to change on the current work of Frankie on his problem identifying part, decided the formatting for the PPT and looked for citation for the my analysing problem part. |
| 1. HOW MUCH DID THE OTHER MEMBERS CONTRIBUTE TO THE MEETING? – GIVE DETAILS. | Frankie: Follow the configuration advises to adapt changes on ppt structure and format. Changed some of the current information to fit requirements, summarizing some information for each slides so the slides don’t look wordy.  Daniel: Offering a little bit of advice to Frankie's content and modified the formatting of his part of the PowerPoint. Secondly, Daniel and I standardised the formatting of the citations and worked together to find the required information online. Lastly, I discussed with Daniel how to change the ppt section that I was responsible for.  All of us gave respect to others when speaking and spoke out opinions with evidence on how something should be improved or changed during the process. |
| 1. DID YOU EXPERIENCE ANY PROBLEMS OR DIFFICULTIES? IF YES WHAT WHERE THEY AND WERE THEY RESOLVED? | Yes, there are a little problem when discussing about the changing needed for the ppt of Frankie’s part. I had a little disagreement on some of the formatting and information he had. But we made it to a reach consensus by showing some other examples of PPT and expressing each other’s idea. Which we found out a formatting way we both like and agree with and we used that formatting. |
| 1. DO YOU KNOW WHAT YOU HAVE TO DO BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING? IF YES, DESCRIBE TASKS TO BE COMPLETED, IF NOT, DESCRIBE WHY YOU ARE UNCLEAR? | Before the next meeting, we have tasks for each other which is I am responsible for the problem analysis part where I have to describe why the problem mentioned is bad while Frankie finished his part on formatting what he has now. Daniel will finish his part with citations on how improvement can make upon the problems made. We will finish the information parts before the next meeting and discuss about final changes for the third meeting |
| 1. DID YOU AGREE ON NEXT MEETING DATE IF NO, WHY NOT? IF YES, WHEN AND LOCATION. | Date:2024/3/20 13：30  Location: Library 1st floor discussion area  Mode: Face to Face |
| 1. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD AT THIS POINT? FOR EXAMPLE, IF IT WAS NOT A PHYSICAL MEETING, HOW WELL DID THE MEETING FUNCTION, IN YOUR OPINION? WOULD FACE-TO-FACE HAVE BEEN BETTER FOR THIS PARTICULAR MEETING? | More effective discussion after the first face to face meeting as we know more about each other and having a clear view on our work.  Also, finishing the work before the meeting makes us realize how efficient it is for group work communication, and each of us are responsible and actually finished what is required resulting in an efficient meeting.  Meanwhile, I think that for such a group which is formed short-term for a group work, trust and discussion is still important as it really can improve efficiency when we are willing to talk about what whether we really like and think about the work, so changes can be made instantly. |

**Group or team process review checklist from exhibit 8.4**

Are we reviewing our group/team progress regularly and asking questions if the group/team appears to be stuck or off-track? √

Are we encouraging everyone to participate according to agreed guidelines by discussing how much talking is appropriate giving constructive feedback to overtalkative or quiet members using methods to structure the discussion to involve everyone such as brainstorming and round Robin reporting? √

Are we discussing the need for the group/team to agree on limits, the value of balanced participation and focused, relevant discussion? √

Are we politely challenging opinions, such as by asking for supporting evidence? √

Are we encouraging the collection of relevant data before decisions are made too hastily? √

Are we aware of impatience that can lead to premature decision-making by taking breaks; agreeing on the decision-making process; monitoring the steps and reviewing as necessary? √

Are we checking perceptions of other people’s motives by: describe and listening actively, and not blaming; giving all members attention and respect; helping members to express what is important to them? √

Are we preparing a written agenda to focus discussion on topics and time frames by: Recording all TOPICS for prioritizing; directing discussion to agreed priorities and allocating some topics to other group/team meetings if necessary?

Are we selecting group team members so that no adversaries are not in the same group/team? If this is not appropriate, it may be possible to talk to adversaries prior to the group/team meetings to discuss constructive ways of dealing with unproductive conflict. Another opinion may be to encourage adversaries to discuss some areas of difference outside the team meeting to reduce disrupt to the group/team.

**Group Meeting Record 3:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| POINTS TO ADDRESS | STUDENT RESPONSE |
| 1. DATE OF MEETING AND LOCATION (FACE-TO-FACE OR VIRTUAL, PLEASE STATE). | Meeting 3  Date:2024/3/20  Location: Library 1st floor discussion floor  Mode: Face to Face |
| 1. AGREED TIME OF MEETING AND THE TIME MEETING ACTUALLY COMMENCED | Agreed Time: 2024/3/20 14:45- 15:30  Actually Commenced: 2024/3/20 14:30-15:30 |
| 1. DESCRIBE BRIEFLY WHAT YOU COVERED IN THE MEETING. | We commented on each other’s slide and changed our information upon each other’s comment towards the final product |
| 1. WHAT WERE THE OUTCOMES FROM THE MEETING? | The outcome is that we finished commenting and editing our ppt. Where we have our final ppt for presenting. |
| 1. HOW MUCH DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THE MEETING? – GIVE DETAILS. | I commented for the information for Daniel and Fankie’s part. I also formatted all the information we had and changed some of my work upon their suggestions especially on problems like Being Nervous, Grouping, and being late. Also, I have found more references sources to better prove my statement upon the problems. |
| 1. HOW MUCH DID THE OTHER MEMBERS CONTRIBUTE TO THE MEETING? – GIVE DETAILS. | Frankie:  He configured the part of visual aid which is distributed to me and express opinion on others teammate part of visual aid.  Daniel:  In this meeting, he mainly revised his part of the PowerPoint, mainly on some of the parts like the: Complaining/Opposing, Being Inattentive, and, Grouping. Also, he went to look for some extra references for these parts. More than that, he made also some suggestions on the general details of the ppt. |
| 1. DID YOU EXPERIENCE ANY PROBLEMS OR DIFFICULTIES? IF YES WHAT WHERE THEY AND WERE THEY RESOLVED? | Yes, there are, we had difficulties on changing Frankie’s information about his formatting and how he attached the pictures. The problem was solved as we tried different formatting and picture pacing and agreed to the one, we think best.  Another problem is that during the meeting, our attention has been off-track in the middle of the meeting where we were discussing about something else, I noticed it and told everyone we should pay attention back to the presentation. |
| 1. DO YOU KNOW WHAT YOU HAVE TO DO BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING? IF YES, DESCRIBE TASKS TO BE COMPLETED, IF NOT, DESCRIBE WHY YOU ARE UNCLEAR? | We will finish our presentation and each of us will practice presenting our own part and at the same time, prepare our presentation notes for the presentation day. |
| 1. DID YOU AGREE ON NEXT MEETING DATE IF NO, WHY NOT? IF YES, WHEN AND LOCATION. | Yes, we would want a modify presentation day as last meeting.  2024/4/3 14:00  Library 1st floor discussion area |
| 1. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD AT THIS POINT? FOR EXAMPLE, IF IT WAS NOT A PHYSICAL MEETING, HOW WELL DID THE MEETING FUNCTION, IN YOUR OPINION? WOULD FACE-TO-FACE HAVE BEEN BETTER FOR THIS PARTICULAR MEETING? | We have finished our work at this meeting, and we agreed for another meeting to practice our presentation. With all the information done, I would say we have such an efficient and well-performed work during the meetings as we can get everything we want done and solve conflicts. Also, I would like to praise my groupmates for the hardworking and willingness to communicate and help the group. |

**Group or team process review checklist from exhibit 8.4**

Are we reviewing our group/team progress regularly and asking questions if the group/team appears to be stuck or off-track? √

Are we encouraging everyone to participate according to agreed guidelines by discussing how much talking is appropriate giving constructive feedback to overtalkative or quiet members using methods to structure the discussion to involve everyone such as brainstorming and round Robin reporting? √

Are we discussing the need for the group/team to agree on limits, the value of balanced participation and focused, relevant discussion? √

Are we politely challenging opinions, such as by asking for supporting evidence? √

Are we encouraging the collection of relevant data before decisions are made too hastily? √

Are we aware of impatience that can lead to premature decision-making by taking breaks; agreeing on the decision-making process; monitoring the steps and reviewing as necessary? √

Are we checking perceptions of other people’s motives by: describe and listening actively, and not blaming; giving all members attention and respect; helping members to express what is important to them? √

Are we preparing a written agenda to focus discussion on topics and time frames by: Recording all TOPICS for prioritizing; directing discussion to agreed priorities and allocating some topics to other group/team meetings if necessary? √

Are we selecting group team members so that no adversaries are not in the same group/team? If this is not appropriate, it may be possible to talk to adversaries prior to the group/team meetings to discuss constructive ways of dealing with unproductive conflict. Another opinion may be to encourage adversaries to discuss some areas of difference outside the team meeting to reduce disrupt to the group/team.

**Group Meeting Record 4:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| POINTS TO ADDRESS | STUDENT RESPONSE |
| 1. DATE OF MEETING AND LOCATION (FACE-TO-FACE OR VIRTUAL, PLEASE STATE). | Meeting 4  Date:2024/4/3  Location: Library 1st floor discussion area  Mode: Face to face |
| 1. AGREED TIME OF MEETING AND THE TIME MEETING ACTUALLY COMMENCED | Agreed time: 2024/4/3 14:00-15:00  Actually Commenced: 2024/4/3 13:55- 15:00 |
| 1. DESCRIBE BRIEFLY WHAT YOU COVERED IN THE MEETING. | We edited our final ppt with absorbing some of the good and bad parts of other member’s ppt in class and also practiced on presenting |
| 1. WHAT WERE THE OUTCOMES FROM THE MEETING? | The outcomes are that we have our final product PPT along with being more familiar with our information and presenting |
| 1. HOW MUCH DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THE MEETING? – GIVE DETAILS. | I gave comments on all the slides along with suggesting on animations for better look and edited my own part according to their comments. Also, I prepared my notes and helped along with theirs |
| 1. HOW MUCH DID THE OTHER MEMBERS CONTRIBUTE TO THE MEETING? – GIVE DETAILS. | Daniel: He changed his part of PPT and drafted his notes, he also gave some comments for my PPT which is helpful.  Frankie: He changed his part of PPT and drafted his notes, he also formatted some slides I missed.  We had collected some data or example from the day’s class presentation by other students in class and improved ours during the practice presentation. |
| 1. DID YOU EXPERIENCE ANY PROBLEMS OR DIFFICULTIES? IF YES WHAT WHERE THEY AND WERE THEY RESOLVED? | Yes, there were, I and Frankie had some comments on Danile’s slides, and he think his format is better, so discussion on the pros and cons which finally resulted in a same format for our presentation |
| 1. DO YOU KNOW WHAT YOU HAVE TO DO BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING? IF YES, DESCRIBE TASKS TO BE COMPLETED, IF NOT, DESCRIBE WHY YOU ARE UNCLEAR? | No, this will be our last meeting so there will be nothing extra to do |
| 1. DID YOU AGREE ON NEXT MEETING DATE IF NO, WHY NOT? IF YES, WHEN AND LOCATION. | No, this will be our last meeting |
| 1. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD AT THIS POINT? FOR EXAMPLE, IF IT WAS NOT A PHYSICAL MEETING, HOW WELL DID THE MEETING FUNCTION, IN YOUR OPINION? WOULD FACE-TO-FACE HAVE BEEN BETTER FOR THIS PARTICULAR MEETING? | For all these meetings I would say face to face mode of meetings did really help our work and improved a lot on the efficiency where we can see and look on others to give out our opinions. I learned from this experience, and I would wish that all group works and meetings in the future, I would prefer face to face mode. |

**Group or team process review checklist from exhibit 8.4**

Are we reviewing our group/team progress regularly and asking questions if the group/team appears to be stuck or off-track? √

Are we encouraging everyone to participate according to agreed guidelines by discussing how much talking is appropriate giving constructive feedback to overtalkative or quiet members using methods to structure the discussion to involve everyone such as brainstorming and round Robin reporting? √

Are we discussing the need for the group/team to agree on limits, the value of balanced participation and focused, relevant discussion? √

Are we politely challenging opinions, such as by asking for supporting evidence? √

Are we encouraging the collection of relevant data before decisions are made too hastily? √

Are we aware of impatience that can lead to premature decision-making by taking breaks; agreeing on the decision-making process; monitoring the steps and reviewing as necessary? √

Are we checking perceptions of other people’s motives by: describe and listening actively, and not blaming; giving all members attention and respect; helping members to express what is important to them? √

Are we preparing a written agenda to focus discussion on topics and time frames by: Recording all TOPICS for prioritizing; directing discussion to agreed priorities and allocating some topics to other group/team meetings if necessary?

Are we selecting group team members so that no adversaries are not in the same group/team? If this is not appropriate, it may be possible to talk to adversaries prior to the group/team meetings to discuss constructive ways of dealing with unproductive conflict. Another opinion may be to encourage adversaries to discuss some areas of difference outside the team meeting to reduce disrupt to the group/team. √