

Our group worked relatively well throughout the semester. Everyone was incredibly respectable and followed up on meetings and showed up on time. We worked together in a **democratic** fashion and didn't have anyone as a dedicated leader. If we all agreed on something, then it passed. If we all didn't accept an idea, then we usually wouldn't do it. We didn't have any apparent issues of **group pressure for uniformity**, as everyone was incredibly respectable and not overly opinionated. For our first speech practice together, everyone was awesome and offered excellent advice. There wasn't any judgment or bad vibes coming from anyone. When we worked together, we had a **norm** set up to be respectable and not overbearing. This stood all throughout our interactions for the year.

The process for our presentation was relatively simple. We discussed in a group chat and made a plan together on how we were going to discuss our topic and what questions we were going to ask.

When discussing ideas, we had a **deliberative dialogue** making our meetings very efficient. The more we met, the more our **public values** became apparent, which was to listen, not be judgemental, and be respectful. When we picked our topic for our group presentation, we started with a broad conceptual idea and narrowed it down. We began with COVID 19 quarantine hobbies as a first idea and then broadened it even more to just COVID 19. We decided to sharpen it up a little bit by choosing to focus on how each country handled the virus outbreak. We made a public document where we could each type in our ideas and brainstorm a little bit about what, in particular, we were going to discuss. We decided to do it by country. It was a bit too specific, so we broadened it to regions. We then chose different areas and did a little bit of research about each one. We then went over our questions to make sure none were

conflicting or that we didn't have any conflicting ideas about our points. It was a good move since Sean and Logan had both highly opposing points, one praising Australia and the other demolishing Australia. They appropriately switched out the questions to make the presentation not contradict. I would say each of us had about an equal role. We would all offer an idea and think about it and decide as a group. There wasn't a dedicated person who did everything or was a leader. I would say our efforts and actions were very equally spread out.