

Title page

Name: Mathurin Chanfort Bougne Nzokou

Student ID: 2535905

Module Name: LCLM4003 Effective Teamworking

Assessment: Week 5 Video Based In-class Assessment

Answers

Question 1

Explain what teamwork is, give examples from the video.

Teamwork is the coordinated effort of a small number of people who share a common purpose, bring complementary skills and hold themselves mutually accountable for the results (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993). It differs from a loose group of individuals because members depend on one another and share responsibility for the outcome. In the video, six students form a team working on one project. Their strengths complement each other: Lena provides precise, evidence-based research, Omar brings drive and persuasion, Hannah offers careful evaluation, Kenji supports group harmony, Priya connects people and solves problems, and Alex organises data with digital tools. Teamwork becomes visible when the group agrees to use Omar's framework while Lena verifies the data within 48 hours, so that both speed and accuracy are served and each member is accountable for a clear contribution.

Question 2

Omar states that the team has been debating for two hours, the team members look worried. Lena intervenes and argues, Omar intervenes again. Hannah looks troubled. (timestamp: 2:00 – 2:56). Identify which of Tuckman's Stages of Team Development this part of the video represents.

This part of the video represents the storming stage of Tuckman's model (Tuckman, 1965; Tuckman and Jensen, 1977). In storming, the early politeness of forming gives way to disagreement, conflict over ideas and competition for influence as members test roles and challenge one another. The scene shows these features. Omar says the team has debated for two hours without agreement, Lena intervenes and argues her case, and Omar interjects again. The conflict concerns how the work should be done, which is typical of this stage. Other members look worried and Hannah appears troubled, showing the emotional tension that storming creates. No decision has been reached and shared norms have not yet emerged. If handled well, storming leads the team towards norming; if ignored, it can stall progress.

Question 3

Identify & explain which Tuckman's Stages of Team Development is the team in during the last 2 minutes of the video (timestamp 4:00 – 5:58).

In the last two minutes the team is in the performing stage of Tuckman's model (Tuckman and Jensen, 1977). At this stage members have resolved their main conflicts, trust one another, understand their roles and concentrate on achieving the shared goal with little need for supervision. Earlier, the team spent two hours debating and Hannah withdrew from the argument. By now Priya's solution, using Omar's framework while Lena verifies the data within 48 hours, has become the agreed way of working. Members contribute according to their strengths, communicate openly and support one another, so the project moves forward

efficiently. Having passed through forming, storming and norming (Tuckman, 1965), the team shows cohesion, shared responsibility and productivity, which are the defining characteristics of performing.

Question 4

Explain what Group Decision Making is, provide a relevant example from the video.

Group decision making is the process in which a group of people collectively identifies options, evaluates them and selects a course of action (Robbins and Judge, 2019). It brings more information, diverse perspectives and greater commitment to the final choice, but it can be slow and may suffer from conformity, dominant members or groupthink (Janis, 1972). In the video, the team must decide how to complete its project. Omar pushes for a quick, confident framework, while Lena insists on thorough, evidence-based verification. The two-hour debate shows the time and conflict that group decisions can involve. The decision is finally reached when Priya proposes adopting Omar's framework while giving Lena 48 hours to verify the data. This combines both viewpoints, so the group reaches a shared decision that every member can support.

Question 5

Explain what Nominal Technique is, provide an example from the video.

The Nominal Group Technique is a structured group decision-making method. Members first generate ideas silently and individually, then share them in turn, clarify them through discussion, and finally rank or vote on them privately (Delbecq, Van de Ven and Gustafson, 1975). Because everyone writes before anyone speaks, it limits domination by confident members, reduces conformity and gives quieter people an equal voice. In the video, the technique would suit the team's two-hour debate. Omar and Lena dominate the discussion, and Hannah is spoken over and trails off. Using the technique, each student would write down proposals silently, present them one by one without interruption, and then rank the options. Hannah's careful evaluation would be heard, and the team would decide through a fair ranking rather than a prolonged argument.

Question 6

What (Thomas-Kilmann model) conflict mode does Priya use when she states "We do not have to choose between being brilliant or being thorough.", and she supports Omar's framework while giving Lena 48 hours to verify the data? (timestamp 3:20 – 3:36)

Priya uses the collaborating mode of the Thomas-Kilmann model (Thomas and Kilmann, 1974). The model describes five conflict modes along two dimensions, assertiveness and cooperativeness: competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding and accommodating. Collaborating is high in both and aims for a win-win solution that fully satisfies everyone's concerns. Priya shows this when she says, "We do not have to choose between being brilliant or being thorough." She rejects the either-or framing between Omar's speed and Lena's

accuracy and integrates both. She supports Omar's framework, so his idea is used, while giving Lena 48 hours to verify the data, so Lena's concern for accuracy is met. This differs from compromising, where each side gives something up, because Priya creates a solution that keeps the best of both approaches.

Question 7

When the debate between Omar and Lena peaks, Hannah responds by "shrinking back slightly in her chair" and softly trailing off as she is spoken over. Using the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode, identify and describe Hannah's conflict mode in this scene. (timestamp 2:00 - 2:45)

Hannah demonstrates the avoiding mode of the Thomas-Kilmann model (Thomas and Kilmann, 1974). Avoiding is low in assertiveness and low in cooperativeness: the person sidesteps the conflict, withdraws and pursues neither their own concerns nor those of others. When the debate between Omar and Lena peaks, Hannah shrinks back slightly in her chair and her voice trails off as she is spoken over. She does not defend her view, challenge either speaker or try to mediate. Her body language shows discomfort and withdrawal. Avoiding can be useful for trivial issues or to let tempers cool (Thomas, 1992), but here it means that her careful, evidence-based perspective is lost and unresolved tension remains in the team, which weakens the quality of the group's discussion.

Question 8

Identify which Belbin roles Alex and Priya might be demonstrating (e.g., Plant, Implementer, Coordinator, Specialist, Monitor Evaluator, etc.) and explain them with relevant examples from the video.

Belbin (2010) argues that team members adopt preferred behaviours called team roles. Alex most closely fits the Implementer role, with Specialist traits. Implementers are practical, disciplined and systematic, turning ideas into workable plans. Alex is described as analytical, deeply practical and tech-savvy, approaching every challenge with a systematic mindset and organising project data and fine-tuning workflows with digital tools. Priya fits the Resource Investigator role, with some Co-ordinator qualities. Resource Investigators are outgoing, enthusiastic networkers who explore opportunities and bring in outside contacts. Priya is described as vibrant, resourceful and a natural networker and problem-solver. Her resolution of the dispute, uniting Omar's framework with Lena's verification, also shows the co-ordinating skill of drawing different viewpoints together. Alex therefore provides structure, while Priya provides energy and connections.

Question 9

Identify which Belbin roles Omar and Lena might be demonstrating (e.g., Plant, Implementer, Coordinator, Specialist, Monitor Evaluator, etc.) and explain them with relevant examples from the video.

Omar most closely demonstrates the Shaper role (Belbin, 2010). Shapers are dynamic, challenging and driven, and they push the team to keep moving. Omar is confident and persuasive, makes quick decisions and motivates others. In the video he raises the length of the debate and pushes the team towards a framework. Lena fits the Completer Finisher role. Completer Finishers are conscientious and detail-oriented, and they check work for errors and insist on high standards. Lena works with care and a consistent dedication to quality, relies on empirical evidence and delivers thoroughly documented work. In the video she argues for verifying the data before the team commits. The tension between Omar's drive and Lena's perfectionism explains the conflict, and shows why teams need a balance of roles.

Question 10

After watching the video, decide which Belbin role you would naturally take in this team and why would you take that role?

In this team I would naturally take the Co-ordinator role (Belbin, 2010). Co-ordinators clarify goals, involve everyone, delegate tasks and manage conflict calmly. The video shows why this role is needed. The team debates for two hours, Omar and Lena compete over speed and accuracy, and Hannah withdraws, because nobody chairs the discussion. A Co-ordinator would set the agenda, invite Hannah and Kenji to speak, summarise the two positions and guide the group to a decision sooner. I would take this role because I listen carefully to different views, stay calm under tension and like to match tasks to people's strengths, for example giving Lena the verification and Alex the data organisation. I would need to avoid over-delegating and make sure I also contribute my own work.

References list

- Belbin, R.M. (2010) *Team roles at work*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Delbecq, A.L., Van de Ven, A.H. and Gustafson, D.H. (1975) *Group techniques for program planning: a guide to nominal group and Delphi processes*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Janis, I.L. (1972) *Victims of groupthink*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Katzenbach, J.R. and Smith, D.K. (1993) 'The discipline of teams', *Harvard Business Review*, 71(2), pp. 111–120.
- Robbins, S.P. and Judge, T.A. (2019) *Organizational behavior*. 18th edn. Harlow: Pearson.
- Thomas, K.W. (1992) 'Conflict and conflict management: reflections and update', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(3), pp. 265–274.
- Thomas, K.W. and Kilmann, R.H. (1974) *Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument*. Tuxedo, NY: Xicom.
- Tuckman, B.W. (1965) 'Developmental sequence in small groups', *Psychological Bulletin*, 63(6), pp. 384–399.
- Tuckman, B.W. and Jensen, M.A.C. (1977) 'Stages of small-group development revisited', *Group & Organization Studies*, 2(4), pp. 419–427.