FIT1049

Assignment 2 Part B

Reflective Report

Faculty of Information Technology

Monash University

Nicholas Chong, 29808146

31st May 2019

Introduction

This report chronologically explores the various aspects of teamwork observed between my team members and I throughout the assignment's progress, with close respect to concepts and theories learned throughout this unit. This report will discuss the process followed by the team in order to achieve our desired outcome, along with a self-reflection of my own contribution, followed by further improvements to aid my future career as an IT professional.

Team Process

Adjusting to the Team

Personally, the natural formation of the team was not observed to all its distinct stages (Tuckman & Jensen, 2010) due to me joining a pre-existing group that has already spent time together and had already experienced the 'forming' and 'storming' stages (Tuckman & Jensen, 2010). In joining this pre-existing group, it was clear that the team was at some point of the 'norming' stage, where the team had an excellent awareness of each other's strengths and weaknesses. This was highlighted when planning the presentation sections for each member to do, when Michael recommended Tony as the presentation opener, mentioning Tony's engaging introduction in the previous assignment.

Leadership Structure

The team leader, Michael, imposed a very flat leadership structure in which every member had equal roles and decision-making between the team was democratic, deciding choices with a Majority-Rules decision model (Robbins & Finley, 1995) if conflict arose.

Allowing more freedom to express their opinions resulted in each member feeling more comfortable with each other, leading to stronger team chemistry.

However, this posed the drawback of the leader always appeasing to the most popular decision between its members, even if the choice was not necessarily the most optimal choice, known as a laissez-faire leadership (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). During the making of the presentation structure, Michael had allowed a member's recommendation to exclude the reference list from the presentation, which would have resulted in a significant loss in marks if no further corrections had been made.

A significant point to consider for this team dynamic was that trust was required in each member's own self-initiative to complete the task, without the pressure that a leader in a hierarchical structure would apply, which applies to the next section.

Communication and Individual Expectations

The team had an autonomous approach in allowing each member to complete their part between meetings, only communicating out of necessity through Facebook Messenger. For example, conversation only occurred when a part was due to be completed or when a meeting was to be planned with no personal topics to potentially grow potential chemistry between the team.

This lack of constant online communication was mitigated by knowing each other's progress using Google Drive and Google Slides, which provided live updates and did not require messaging others to check on their progress.

In person, the team had very good communication, with each member striving to contribute equal quality work and always being aware of each other's current task.

Each team member recognised and either had the same implicit expectations for the assignment or had rose to the occasion due to other's expectations. Having every member place equal effort and care resulted in the flat leadership structure working to a high level of success.

Self-Reflection

Individual Role in the Team

Similar to my personality test (NERIS Analytics Limited, 2019) result as an 'architect', I describe myself as the next leader of the group, helping the leader in delegating tasks and overseeing the whole process of the assignment from start to finish.

I tend to assume such a role naturally during the start of the team formation. This occurs because of my natural urge to plan ahead and willingness to achieve excellent results, with my previous teams experiencing tremendous success with my guidance.

Personal Contribution

Ultimately, I contributed an excellent amount of effort to the team and the assignment, overseeing the entire assignment as well as paying crucial attention to detail. During the creation of the presentation slides, I ensured that the presentation slides were formatted correctly, including proper references for images, the formatting for the reference lists, and consistent styling between each slide.

However, I felt that my contributions were not posed in the most comfortable way, due to the team dynamics of following the path of least resistance, in the hopes of not disrupting team chemistry with a minor disagreement.

Throughout this process, I have gained a deeper understanding of my role as a team member, who is willing to achieve great results while maintaining a strong team chemistry but having to push myself to speak out against a decision that I personally disagree with.

Conclusion and Future Improvements

Through experiencing the interest team dynamics in this assignment, how each member interacts with each other through online means to achieve the same outcome, and my subsequent role in this team as the overseer, I am able to reflect upon and learn future improvements for myself.

Encourage Self Expression

In the future, it will be vital to speak my opinion sooner rather than later and focusing on ignoring any fear of facing social repercussions with a disagreement. This is essential as it is beneficial to bring up an issue earlier to mitigate risks and errors potentially caused by that issue further down any team process. Moreover, to avoid conflict, I need to reassure others that my disagreement with an idea is not a personal attack on them, but instead made for the benefit of the team.

Dealing with Contingencies

Moreover, during the presentation itself, the team had gone overtime with no prior planning for dealing with such contingencies. In the future, I aim to be more aware that a sub-optimal situation may happen and that it is vital to express to future teams about this consideration.

Reference List

Hinkin, T., & Schriesheim, C. (2008). An examination of "nonleadership": From laissez-faire leadership to leader reward omission and punishment omission. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1234.

NERIS Analytics Limited. (2019). *Architect*. Retrieved from 16Personalities: https://www.16personalities.com/intj-personality

Robbins, H., & Finley, M. (1995). *Why teams don't work : what went wrong and how to make it right.* Princeton, N.J. : Peterson's/Pacesetter Books.

Tuckman, B., & Jensen, M. (2010). Stages of Small-Group Development. *Group Facilitation*, 43-48.