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# Introduction

The point of the process report is to show how the team process has influenced the project work, and social interaction in a multi-disciplinary setting.

# Personal characteristic

EVERYONE NEEDS TO FILL IN THEIR INFORMATION

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Teyyub** |  |
| **Age**: **Nationality**: Azerbaijan**Academic background**: Petroleum Engineering |

Teyyub took his bachelor degree… blab la..

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Juan Carlos** |  |
| **Age**: **Nationality**: Mexican**Academic background**:  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dicky** |  |
| **Age**: **Nationality**: Indonesian **Academic background**:  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ole Christian** |  |
| **Age**: **Nationality**: Norwegian**Academic background**:  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ailo** |  |
| **Age**: **Nationality**: Norwegian**Academic background**:  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Malin**  | http://sphotos-c.ak.fbcdn.net/hphotos-ak-frc3/385610_10151011242303338_1967949304_n.jpg |
| **Age**: 24**Nationality**: Norwegian**Academic background**: Chemical Engineering  |

Malin took her Bachelor degree in Biotechnology and chemistry in Oslo. She is now taking her masters in chemical engineering, with focus on chemical process technology. She is a social, loves to bake, which the group really appreciates.

## 2.1 The LIFO test

Theory about behavioral tests.

On the sixth village day, the Life orientation (LIFO) test was introduced to map our personal behavioral styles in favorable and unfavorable conditions. The LIFO test describes four different behavior styles:

1. The Supporting/Giving-in (SG)

2. The Controlling/Taking-over (CT)

3. The Conserving/Holding-on (CH)

4. The Adapting/Dealing-away (AD)

Table 1 Description of the philosophy, goals and strength of the four behavioral styles

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Style of Behavior | Philosophy | Goals | Strength |
| Support giving | Work hard | Prove worth, be helpful. | Principled, cooperative, dedicated, pursues excellence |
| Control taking | Action | Be competent, get results. | Directing persistent, initiative |
| Conserve holding | Reasoning | Getting it right | Analytical, systematic |
| Adaptive dealing | Harmony | Knowing people, get along | Enthusiastic, harmonic, flexible |

The numbers each person scored on each behavior style adds up to 90 points. If you have a score of 30 or more in one style, you are overusing you behavior, if your score is 17 or less you underuse your behavior (also called blind spot). The styles with the highest numbers with a range of plus minus 3 are your preferred style of behavioral. The scores of the favorable/unfavorable conditions for each group member is given in table 2-7.WHICH WAY SHOULD WE PUT IT? Table 2-7 or just table 2.

**Ailo:**

Table 2 Scores of the behavior styles social giving (SG), control taking (CT), conserve holding (CH) and adaptive dealing (AD) in favorable and unfavorable conditions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Person | Favorable conditions | Unfavorable conditions |
|  | SG | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** | **SG** | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** |
| Ailo | 24 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 16 | 22 | 27 | 25 |
| Malin | 27 | 18 | 18 | 27 | 24 | 19 | 19 | 28 |

Ailos preferred behavior styles in favorable conditions are social giving and adaptive dealing

**Malin:**

Table 3 Scores of the behavior styles social giving, Control taking, conserve holding and Adaptive dealing in favorable and unfavorable conditions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Favorable conditions | Unfavorable conditions |
| SG | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** | **SG** | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** |
| 27 | 18 | 18 | 27 | 24 | 19 | 19 | 28 |

Malins preferred behavior styles in favorable conditions are social giving and adaptive dealing. In unfavorable conditions Adaptive dealing is her preferred style. Even though her preferred style is adaptive dealing in unfavorable conditions, it is no much change in the other styles. This means style of behavioral does not change much.

Personal reflections from Malin:

*Malin: I think the results from the Lifo test were very spot on with how I have interpreted my own behavior style in certain situations. I discussed my results with my roommate who is in Norne Village who had also taken the Lifo test*. She also implied that my results suited me very well, in that way that I was always very calm in unfavorable conditions and do not change much. My roommate and I have worked in group projects together before, during my bachelor degree in Oslo and here in Trondheim, and I feel confident that she knows me well under both favorable and unfavorable conditions. With her conformation on my results, I felt confident that this mapping is a good tool to see yourself as a person in a group under certain conditions.

**Juan Carlos**

Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Favorable conditions | Unfavorable conditions |
| SG | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** | **SG** | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** |
| 30 | 13 | 20 | 27 | 23 | 14 | 25 | 28 |

Juan Carlos preferred behavior styles in favorable conditions are social giving and adaptive dealing. He has a blind spot for control taking in both favorable and unfavorable conditions, which means he is using this behavior too little. In unfavorable conditions, his SG decreases from 30 to 23, whereas CH is increasing.

**Dicky**

Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Favorable conditions | Unfavorable conditions |
| SG | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** | **SG** | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** |
| 18 | 22 | 27 | 23 | 16 | 21 | 21 | 32 |

**Ole Christian**

Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Favorable conditions | Unfavorable conditions |
| SG | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** | **SG** | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** |
| 27 | 18 | 25 | 20 | 21 | 19 | 25 | 25 |

**Teyyub**

Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Favorable conditions | Unfavorable conditions |
| SG | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** | **SG** | **CT** | **CH** | **AD** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Teyyubs preferred behavior style according to the test were… Teyyb expressed his feelings about the LIFO test pretty early, that he thought it was a useless tool. In that way you did not get to know the person on a personal level…

## Creating a productive group

A curve developed by Johnson and Johnson, illustrates the performance level of small groups to clarify the difference between ineffective and effective group (figure X). Four different types of groups are described in the figure, pseudogroups, traditional work groups, effective groups and high performance groups. The purpose of the curve is to show how the performance level depends on the structure of the group.

FIGURE

IS IT NECESARRY TO WRITE SO DETAILED?

The four following shortly described, a pseudo group is a group which the members have been placed together without wanting to be in a group. The structure implies competition against one another. The traditional work group is a group who has accepted that they have to work together, but only interact when they divide the work and clarify how it is to be done. They believe that they are awarded individually and not as members of the group and they see little benefit of being in a group.

An effective group is a group where all group members are committed to maximize the effect of… The qualities of an effective group are that they have a strong mutual goals, positive interdependence, promotive interaction, strong membership, strong mutual identity and positive relations. [1]

A high performance group meets all the criteria for being an effective group and outperforms expectations. The difference between a high performance group and an effective group is the level of commitment the members have to one another to the group success.

We would define our group as an effective group with a highly potential of becoming a high performance group. All group members have built up a mutual trust for one another and work well together to accomplish our shared goals: to get a good grade, learn new aspects of our self with working in a group and working cross curricular. Much of this good group dynamics may come from having good team building in and outside of school. The meetings make us more comfortable and secure on each other. We are enjoying ourselves with tequila, “clapping games” and dancing. This allows us to have a more direct communication, not always worrying about stepping on someone’s toes. However, the members in the group still feel we may be too nice to each other, too adaptive, maybe to the point of being “giving” (as in the LIFO characterization). We don’t feel like this totally destroys the group, but that it may be a factor that slows us down and makes us less efficient.

The group’s aspect for our good team building is due to the following actions: giving honest and constructive feedback, speaking freely and honest and have social events outside of school to get to know each other on a closer, personal level.

Add a situation with some personal reflections?

**Our confidence to one another became very clar under the 10’th village day when two episodes were brought up:** On the 10th village day, the SPGR exercise was performed. The SPGR test/exercise maps the behaviors of each of the group members by using some given adjectives describing behavior in three areas: control, rebellion and care.

The group members felt that the exercise perhaps would have been more appropriate earlier in the process. At this point the group felt like the level of confidence and security among the group members were strong, so that the group members can be honest and speak their mind.

Malin made a comment illustrating her confidence in the group by recalling an episode during the honesty exercise that was performed on village day number 9. Each person was to write their own reflection about honesty and then share your reflection with a new group of people. **SUGGESTION:**

*Malin: When I was supposed to discuss my reflections about honesty to a new group of people, I felt uncomfortable to speak my mind and sharing my opinions with new people. After this exercise it became clear how comfortable I was with my group.*

**Add more personal reflection here? And what did the other group members feel about this exercise?**

The clearest example of our confidence towards each other came during check-in on the 10th village day. Ole Christian raised an issue that he and also Malin felt had been undiscussable. This action was a consequence of a discussion made on the previous Sunday, when the group had decided to meet and work. Teyyub did not show, and did not respond to the group’s calls or texts. Ole Christian felt that this action was necessary as this affected his work and thinking, and also impaired the groups work. Juan Carlos did not come to the meeting either, but in contrast to Teyyubs’s behavior, Juan Carlos called and let the group know that he could not come because of illness.

The issue brought up regarded what Ole Christian and Malin perceived to be Teyyub’s lack of honesty and commitment with the group. After discussion, Teeuub explained it, expressed his apologies and commitment for the work ahead. HERE WE NEED REFELCTION FROM AT LEAST MALIN, OLE CHRISTIAN AND TEYYUB.

For us to become a high performance group further commitment to both process report and technical report must be achieved. NEED SOME MORE “KJØTT” HERE!

##  2. Development of the group

Jonhnson and Johnson have identified seven stages of development, the stages over time is illustrated in Figure X. [1]The group development stages illustrated will be further described in the next section.

FIGURE

### 2.1Defining and Structuring Procedures

When the group is placed together

### 2.2Conforming to Procedures and Getting Acquainted

In this stage the group members are learning the weaknesses and the strengths of each other.

### 2.3Recognizing Mutuality and building trust

In this stage the group members have positive interdependence among eachother, and are encouraged to engage in both trust and trustworthy behaviors.

### 2.4 Rebelling and differentiating

### 2.5 Committing to the groups goals, procedures and members

### 2.6 Functioning maturely and productively

### 2.7 Terminating

The goals of the group is met

We could start with the Norwegian/non-Norwegian issue, which we have been very aware of and implemented actions to keep under control. Our group has three Norwegians, one from Azerbaijan one from Indonesia and one from Mexico. The Norwegians have a language that only they understand, while the exchange students do not speak a common language besides English. It is obvious that this increases the risk of a tension between the two groupings, a so-called polarization. The log for person A (which is Norwegian) reads: “During lunch today most of the group was sitting together. O and M started a conversation in Norwegian. I joined in, but soon dropped out as I felt that it was inconsiderate towards the non-Norwegians.”

The group has been aware of this fact, and this issue was raised during the group reflection at the end of the fifth village day. What was interesting was that the non-Norwegians were unanimous in that they did not feel like it was problem. However, the Norwegians decided that they were going to try to speak more English in the presence of the others.

We have also taken other actions to ensure that this wouldn’t develop into a problem. A sizeable portion of the work doesn’t require any specific education, so we are free to arbitrarily delegate it to smaller subgroups within our team. In doing so, we have tried to split the groups so that we mix Norwegians and the non-Norwegians. We don’t let this compromise the project, however. Some parts of the project are better handled by people with specific skills. As an example, the only two people who know HYSYS are Norwegians, and we feel it’s natural that they team up and concentrate on that.

J doesn’t feel like the leader, in the sense that pepole is expecting from him what to do, and he feels this is good, because he feels everybody takes the leadership when they know what to do and how to do it.

Looking back at the “election”, we feel that it may have been hurried. Kleppe and the Statoil said we needed the leader. It was a tie between J and O, and none took it willingly.

A said part of the reason he voted for J was that he is mature.

M was unsure about the whole leadership thing, not knowing if we needed it.

Pick out a specific situation and compare people’s behaviour with their score.

In the group reflection at the end of the day, people voiced their opinions about the LIFO test. T was very critical, arguing that the score on this test could tell anything essential about a person. M and J disagreed, and felt that they recognized themselves in the results they had gotten. A felt that this potential conflict was handled very maturely, J stating that he respected T’s opinion, but disagreed. And T replied “of course, it’s mutual”. We believe this kind of mutual respect has been a crucial part in getting our diverse group to function properly. *Johnson and Johnson* state this as their first point in “rules for constructive controversy”. We did not pursue the discussion further at the time.

It should be mentioned that the non-Norwegian members had to perform the LIFO test in Norwegian, using Google translate. This is one of the few times (the only??) that we feel that the external arrangements were not handles professionally. Maybe T’s score would have made more sense if he had gotten the test in English? Though grateful for the opportunity to take this test, we feel this screw-up compromises the utilization of this tool to the fullest (do we?).

Once we know what kind of behaviours the group members have, we can be awere of what kind of situations we can get in and try to avoid them if they are bad for the group.

## Constructive feedback

Feedback: it has mostly been of the positive type the first 6 village days. We think that a session of constructive criticism/advice to each other, can be an action against the “niceness-issue”. And it can also help people uncover their so-called blind spots (we can compare this against the “LIFO” blind spot).

This is an action we as a group take because we feel that is what *this* group needs, even if this isn’t an exercise in any book.

Good cooperation aspect in our project was successfully implemented. We are coming from different background. O from Natural Gas Technology, T from Petroleum Engineering, D from Petroleum Geosciences, A from Mathematic, M from Chemical Engineering and J from Petroleum Geosciences. Each member contributes a lot both in technical & process part. In technical part, by guidance from O & T that have expertise in this project, the rest of group member can deliver complete job.

In process part, we refer to “NTNU EiT compendium 2013”. Each member of the group should read that compendium. There are 6 chapters on that book, and we decided to divide 2 chapters for each member and there is one chapter overlap within 2 members. By the end, we present our chapter to another group member to reflect our process condition and to improve our group goal based on “NTNU EiT compendium 2013”.



Figure.1 (EiT Guide for students 2013)

As seen on the figure above that project work and the reflection on the cooperation in the team influences each other

O made a comment that our reflection has lately put much focus on negative aspects of the group. But the group feels that the positive aspects far outweigh these, and the reason for this should also be reflected upo

**Is this something to add to the beginning of the report?**

During the second village day each group member was given the task to answer the two following questions:

1. *What are your expectations for team work in Gullfaks Village 2013?*
2. *Based on your earlier experiences, what is important for you when cooperating with others?*

All group members shared their expectations and experiences and they were as following:

Malin:

1. *Learn from each other, be a better “team mate”, good communication and get better at explaining in general.*
2. *Communication, prevent misunderstandings, ask if there is something you di not understand and start working on both tasks right away,*

# OLE

To be started out with we were a really good group. The first day I really felt like everybody had a good time, and that everybody stated their point of view on this course. After check in, it seemed as so everybody was eager and committed to this course. We agreed on, as a group, to aim for an A. Achieving this is not easy, so we knew that we had to put a lot of effort into this project to achieve it.

At that time I felt like we had something special. We were a high performance group, (Johnson & Johnson, 2006).The reason for this was that we had an open communication, we shared everything. We started scheduling when to meet up outside school. Interacting outside of school made us stronger as a group, and also stronger as individuals in the group. By stronger as individuals I mean that we feel more comfortable when we are in the group. More comfortable to speak, do actions and maybe most important; to talk about undiscussable issues.

A long the way one person started to miss out on all this, and this has started to affect the group as a whole. In order to be a high performance group, actions needs to be taken. If not, our main goal of achieving an A will never happen.

Actions were made. We talked about the issue regarding T. The issue has mainly been on T showing up late sometimes, not participating on social activities outside of school and not having lunch with the rest of the group. In addition O and M had a feeling that T is not always telling the truth. There has been episodes were T is suppose to upload work on dropbox, but nothing is uploaded. When confronted with this, T says he forgot it or left the work on another computer. This is just assumptions from O and M's side, and according to ground rule one: Test assumptions and inference by Schwarz 2002, these assumptions should be tested.

The approach of the talk was done using examples from Ground rule eight: Discuss undiscussable issues, Schwarz 2002. This approach was used as professional start of the conversation to make everything clear, and so that everyone understood the seriousness of the situation.

The conversation started out something like this: "I want to raise what I think has been an undiscussable issue in the group. I'm raising it not to put anyone in the spot, but because I think we can be a much more effective team of we address this issue. I'm worried about discussing the issue because I'm concerned I might get defensive, or others might get defensive. If you see me getting defensive, please let me know".

From O's log this day, it's clear that this conversation has made an impact on him. O writes: Feel a lot better after talking about this undiscussable issue today. For my conscience it was good to confront T about my assumptions. The last couple of days I have felt guilty about assuming that T is dishonest. Glad to finally get this over with. I now feel more focused about my work. Seems like the group are more connected after the talk as well, and more relaxed. The rest of the day was filled with good work, card games during lunch and a lot of laughter. I now hope we can become a high performance group again.

**The effect of members in the group not being present**

As time has gone by, each member in the group has got a unique role. When a member of the group is missing out one day this effects the group. In this section this effect will be explained, putting emphasis on each person’s role in the group.

Village day 4: T was away because of a trip to Finland. This was in the early stages of the project, and a lot of new material was presented this day. O writes in his log: “I really felt that we missed T today. With his expertise we would have understood what to do with the task earlier. As a result of this we had the first day with overtime”.

Village day 10: M was away due to an extended Easter holiday. After Easter there was a lot of catching up to do. The group spent one hour just organizing and talking about the work done so far, and what needed to be done before the final deadline. Afterwards we divided the work, and mostly worked for ourselves the rest of the day. In addition A and O had a good chat with a head facilitator today.

The group felt strong that M was missing today. T said he missed her mood, enthusiasm, jokes and her ideas. With M present, the organizing of the work would have gone faster. More important is that M missed out the meeting with the head facilitator, since M is responsible for the process report. During this conversation we had the opportunity to ask all kinds of questions about the process report.

M was missing today and we were missing her. M called to check up on the group. She said that she was working on the process report, and felt guilty for not being here. This made the group feel good, and we look forward to see her again next time.

We started out as a group of six individuals, the only link being that all of us are civil engineers that have chosen the Gullfaks village. We are diverse when it comes to demographic characteristics, personality characteristics and abilities and skills. Indeed, all teams have varying degrees of diversity among its members. As pointed out in [*Johnson and Johnson]*, this diversity can have beneficial consequences such as increasing productivity and fostering perspective taking, but can also cause harm through interaction strain and communication barriers.

Now I feel that we’re no longer only a group. We have matured and become a bona fide team. The group has attained a team identity, and at least A feels like the that the team has a positive and constructive atmosphere within, allowing for candid discussions. This team identity, as well as the personal relationships we have developed over our time together, allowing for more candid discussion, are listed in *[Johnson and Johnson]*as two of four key points in ”Making member diversity a strength”. These points have indeed been the red line in our process work, the place where we have directed our conscious thought and effort, as we feel that succeeding in these areas will smooth out many of the kinks a diverse group often is forced to tackle.

One of the reasons for achieving this, and thus increasing the chance that diversity will be a source of creativity and productivity, is surely the many times we have met up outside the village and spent time with each other. A is almost surprised over how effective this has been, and also M emphasizes how much more comfortable she has become with our group. These meetings have made us personal friends, and led us to develop an internal culture; keywords being dancing, M’s cinnamon rolls, the TV show ”Idol”, tequila, and of course the celebrated ”clapping game”. In addition to having loads of fun, we feel that it has been a worthile ”investment” into improving the group dynamics.

Unfortunately, T has not been able to come to any of these events. The effect of non-work related activities in one way becomes even more apparent when considering this. T is the group’s undisputed rebel, and while rebels aren’t necessarily detrimental, A have sometimes felt that T is an outsider compared to the others. However, the group has also spent leisure-time together during the village days, and the fact that T hasn’t met us outside is more of a delay to our group becoming a high-performance group than a complete roadblock. A also suspects that his absence at our meet-ups could have been a contributing factor to O and M not feeling that T was commited and playing with all cards on the table. Fortunately, the group has had an open communication about this theme, and T has also been straight with the group.

(I think it would be very good in the process report if T wrote a paragraph expressing his point of view on this.)

Although I have a strong sense of our team, I notice that when working on the technical part, there is a tendency to divide the group into O&M and C&D, with A and T being more on their own. This is OK for all the group members (I think?!), and considering the skills and expertise of the members this is what makes most sense. Keeping this in mind, however, we should perhaps make a conscious effort to jumble this up when working on the process part.

# DICKY

We are in group number one consist of 6 student with 4 nationality, Ole, Ailo & Malin are from Norwegian, Teyyub from Azerbaijan, Juan Carlos from Mexico and Dicky from Indonesia. We are also coming from different academic background and knowledge. Those facts give us a wide contribution aspect to our Gulfaks Project.

We start the project with a good behavior, a lot of spirit, eager to challenge this project, idea & positive thinking since we established a goal that we have to get “A” score for this course. Working with different nationality with different language & culture usually give us worse condition in communicate something, but here in group number one I didn’t feel like that. Teyub, Juan Carlos and Dicky (Non Norwegian) speak English. Malin, Ailo & Ole (Norwegian) also speak English in group, but the nice things from them that they ask permission to us non-Norwegian if sometimes they will use Norwegian instead of English to speak with another Norwegian in order to get easily communicate.

Teamwork was done with gathering in beginning to discuss the issued from different point of view, divided the job into some parts depend on the expertise of group member and finished by the end by meeting updated the job and writing on the report. Time scheduling and person in charged delegation has been created in the beginning of the project to be effectively working together and to be on time with the deadline. In realization, because of heavy load on the project task to do, we have to arrange extra time on weekend to catch up with time scheduling that we already agreed.

Some obstacles already happen in the process of our group work, it’s mostly related to our personal behavior in order to see and facing the issue that a rise in our work. That obstacle always discussed in our group in order to find win-win solution so that we can continue our project in a good track.

We also build teamwork aspect outside the project in campus. As we believed that was good aspect if we can know behavior of each member of the group in term of to understand each other. We have done several outside activity like party game (card & clapping games) with traditional “Tequila” Mexican beverage and some other refreshments that brings by everyone to Malin’s house. Another time we meet in Ola’s house to do some Mario’s card with special delicious brownies made by Malin, and another refreshments from everyone. Those kind activity (outside campus) bring us to the situation where we feel very comfortable when work together in the real project.

Democracy is the things that really happen in our group, everyone has eager & allow speaking his/her mind without any judgment as “stupid question or stupid answer”. After that the rest of the group member also give his/her opinion in order to give their perspective of response. By the end, some solution was “flying on the sky” that we are the group make a decision to final solution collectively.