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# Introduction

This report will review and reflect the events and work that took place during our team project for Developing Quality software. The aim is to look at how we worked as a team, the techniques we used and what we learned from it. It will details the rights, the wrongs, and what can be improved in the future.

# Team Organisation

Team Organisation is the backbone behind completing a mutual task effectively. A team should be organised into having both individual and group work, as well as accountability for both. A strong team should show exemplary discussion and decision-making skills, being able to account for the ideas of all members and incorporate that into results that fit the criteria of the task. Through combined efforts of each member and their

output to the group, a team’s performance will be greater than the sum of its parts.

## Team Development Process Model (Bruce W. Tuckman, 1965)

In its simplest terms, it is a model of five distinct stages a group would experience on the path to becoming an effective team. I will evaluate our team’s performance to the stages involved. One of the only caveats in the comparison is that our team members were all good friends beforehand, which removed a lot of the awkwardness and bond-creating involved with a team of strangers.

### Collection (Forming)

The initial stage of team creating is forming the actual team from individuals brought together to complete the mutual task. It relies on some form of self-made authority, and establishing the expectation of team members. It’s not entirely relevant to our own group because we formed the teams of our own accord, with previous friends. In some respects, we actually did meet the idea that participants are initially enthusiastic, as the prospect of completing a task with friends was indeed good motivation to propel the progress of the task. It was effective in that we were completely comfortable discussing our ideas with each other, as well as what was effectively ‘arguing’ our points. The need for an authoritative figure was reduced when everyone was comfortable with each other.

### Entrenchment (Storming)

This phase is the idea that when teammates have settled down, tension starts to build because people all have their own preconceived ideas to solve the task which creates difficulty coming to a joint solution, thus a period of unproductivity. As previously mentioned in the forming stage, due to existing friendships we were generally more open towards others’ thoughts and ideas. There were occasionally underlying issues with disagreeing on things, as is natural in any team infrastructure, but was dealt with accordingly. We didn’t struggle with any kind of competition or confusion as everyone was happy in their immediate roles and adapting to the task at hand.

### Resolution/Accommodation (Norming)

This phase for us had more to do with settling into the task than coming together as a team generally, though the planning helped improve the team dynamic too. Some of the issues in the last phase were caused by lack of forward thinking during the early stages of the project, which meant people had slightly differing ideas on what was happening. Thanks to more careful use of team theory and methods of planning, we bounced ideas and built off each other as intended, and the uses of working as a team began to shine through. We settled into our roles and stuck to our plans which allowed the group to make solid progress. It wasn’t perfect, and there was some disagreements (naturally) but were easily solved by discussion and compromise.

### Synergy (Performing)

The optimal stage of teamwork, assuming the previous sections were successful, and the output of the group is greater than the sum of its parts. We all had the team’s combined vision in our heads and worked hard towards the end-goal. Everyone was at their upmost comfort in the team environment, and used this to convey ideas and theories which could be quickly adapted and implemented by the team. It was aided by everyone’s commitment to the task, and the small team size meant that synergising was easy.

### Dorming

This is a post-synergy phase between performance and decline, related to complacency from the performance phase. We never really experienced it because a lot of our work was completed in a small time-frame, so we powered through it; having the goal in sight was the cause for a lot of motivation, so we essentially experienced the synergy until just about the end. We tried to help each other forward when someone was demotivated, and the team ethic was a driving force for the project.

### Decline/Breakup (Mourning)

The period of teamwork where the work rate begins to decline as people grow bored/tired and drift away. As a whole we didn’t really get the chance to experience this due to the relatively short time frame of the project. By the time we got to implementation, we powered through until practically the end. It only reared itself towards the very end of our coding stage, when after long stretches of doing work people were becoming jaded and this was coming through in lazy code, more disagreements and less overall productivity. Our motivation to finished helped us overcome this, allowing us to finish the project more-or-less in the synergy phase.

## Belbin Team Role Theory

The Belbin theory is a study on how some teams can be more effective than others. It is the idea that a team should have a good balance of different team roles, each role with its own strengths and weaknesses. If you compare these roles with our team, you can draw comparisons and identify who had the characteristics of certain roles, and can also see what we lacked to evaluate what would’ve helped us. It’s not relevant to the fullest extent because we don’t have enough members to fill all the roles anyway, however having a good mix is important whatever the size.

I would consider myself as the Plant, and Completer-Finisher for the project. I came up with a lot of the original ideas for the implementation which my teammates liked, which was to do with my own creativity and enjoyment of the task at hand. I started a lot of it independently early in the process to create the baselines before involving the other team members to complete certain functions. I had created a good base for the project in a few days which gave us plenty of time to build on. It was the same attention to detail that allowed me to strive for perfection at the end of the task and complete it to a high standard before the deadline. This does, however, due to stress lead to anxiety and distrust of other teammates to complete the task how I want it; even though they can.

Another one of our members acted as a Shaper through the duration of the task. They had the specifics of the projects in mind and knew exactly what they wanted it to be, no matter how difficult. They used this motivation to manage the team assertively, thus completing the task to the necessary standard and detail. At the very end of our implementation, one of our features related to getting the quota wasn’t fully implemented, and the rest of us were prepared to sacrifice it due to difficulty. He yet persisted on the task, and after time using his Shaper characteristics finished the task to a good standard. One of the downsides of the Shaper attitude is sometimes being pushy as they see the task in their own specific way and are unwilling to budge on their own ‘vision’.

We also had someone who displayed characteristics of an Implementer. They approached the problem programmatically with practical, controlled approaches using their hard-work to complete the task in a very logical manner. They used a lot of their time to refactor code, create strong back-end functions and worked hard to create a very scalable program. The good part about it was that in the long term it was easier to program when we had a solid set of reusable functions, however their weakness was being unwilling to let other people change the backend when it was required.

Our other main identifiable Belbin role was the Resource Investigator. They were very outgoing with their communication and liked to explore new approaches and ideas wherever possible. He was heavily involved with collating people’s ideas and turning these into more usable implementations, specifically for our user interface. They wanted to make sure everyone had an input to try and best meet the specifications of the task. The problem they faced was staying motivated when everyone was ‘plugged in’ independently trying to finish the task in time for the deadline, because communication had slowed down.

It was quite difficult to completely categorise the team into Belbin roles, as in terms of our own members it wasn’t very black and white. It was our first team task, and a lot of the people exerted characteristics of many roles along the way as they settled in and learned their own skills. Towards the end it became more visible, but as everyone had their own input in every task it varied. To characterise people more specifically we looked at their input throughout all the tasks. I think what we lacked in the project was someone who was an outward team leader; or in Belbin terms, a Coordinator/Teamworker. We often felt the need for someone to take control, as usually team leading was shared between the five of us. Lack of centralised leadership meant disagreement which led to lack of productivity. In future, we should begin by allocating a leadership task to one of the members at the very start of the process. We struggled by having differing visions sometimes which made the elements of the software feel disjointed and independent, compared to a cohesive product.

## Barriers to Team Working

### Leadership

I previously mentioned that the lack of leadership caused some difficulties to ripple throughout the project, which I will expand on here. Usually when you’re matched up with teammates randomly, one or two people initially take command to lead the project as people get to know each other. This leads to natural team leader roles forming, and the project continues as normal. The difference for us was that we were all friends, and were open with each other and nobody fell into a leadership role. This caused several issues throughout the project. Everyone had their own ideas and concepts for the implementation of the system, and everyone saw their own ideas as ‘correct’ so pushed for them. Compromising ideas was difficult when everyone had their own agenda and it would’ve benefited us to have someone to take command and make decisions for the good of the team. I think the team member that displayed characteristics of ‘Shaper’ would’ve been most fit to take charge of the team as they were driven and motivated to complete the task, with good communication skills.

### Time Management

A problem that effects many teams is managing time scale of the project, something that stems into the issue we had with leadership. We began the project quite efficiently, everyone completing the goal in good time to a good standard. This gave us a false sense of security with the timeframes given, and for the implementation section we became lax and had to rush a lot of work towards the end of the deadline. This of course compromised quality and caused tensions to be high. Underestimating this was due to lack of sticking to the proper planning that we made earlier, so the solution is quite clear. We had already expended the effort to make solid plans, but we just chose to ignore them later on; next time would be rectified by having a team leader who pushed for people to stick to individual deadlines.

## Teamwork Summary

Even though we did share a lot of similarities between ‘ideal’ teamwork models, both Belbin and Tuckman, it also made clear the issues that caused the most difficulty within our team. There are clear elements that we could’ve rectified that would’ve improved our end-product. The most prominent of which, that has already been heavily discussed, is leadership. The rest of our problems were clear stems from a lack of central vision, including communication, time management and implementation errors. Nonetheless I believe by the end of the process the team had gelled together, and we put our all into making the final implementation something we were proud of. Several members were heavily motivated, and in part due to enjoyment of programming, spent a lot of time striving for the end goal. Experience throughout the task also helped us learn efficient methods which can be continued in the future.