



Team iPhone

Charity Jernigan

Yue Liu

Jessica Rose

Quintin Magruder

Hannah Ashley

Intensive English Program

Table of Contents

Part I Community: Intensive English Program.....	3
Part II: The Group Processes.....	9
Appendix A: <i>Group Contract</i>	20
Appendix B: <i>Team iPhone Blog</i>	23
Appendix C: <i>Meeting Agendas and Meeting Notes</i>	25
Appendix D: <i>Group Project Plan</i>	29
Appendix E: <i>Gantt chart</i>	31
Appendix F: <i>Interview and Research Data</i>	32
Appendix G: <i>P-MOPs (Original and Revised)</i>	34

Part I Community: Intensive English Program

The community that we observed was the Intensive English Program (IEP) at Oklahoma Baptist University. This community embodies around thirty international students whose first language was not English. The students are from Brazil, Argentina, Chile South Africa, China, Korea, and Japan. The importance of the IEP community is that the community is from other countries, different cultures and they represent a distinct and diverse part of the Oklahoma Baptist University (OBU) student body. Other members and stakeholders of the IEP community include the following; the international students from the aforementioned countries, the American student workers, and the English teaching professors.

We had a meeting at the beginning of this project to decide what community we would “get to know” this semester. We chose The IEP community firsthand because Yue Yue suggested it. Yue Yue was familiar with the program because she was a part of it in 2008. Other choices we suggested as a group included the *Hope House* community located off campus and the OBU janitorial staff. We decided that we wanted to work with an on campus community and then we thought it would be fun to work with a community of people that are around the same age as us. For that reason, the IEP community was the community we chose. (For our *know the community* project plan, see Appendix D.)

Team iPhone spent a total of eleven hours with the IEP community. Yue Yue started us off by spending an hour with some Chinese IEP students before we conducted the interview. She informed them of what we were going to be doing over the next few weeks. The interview was then conducted a few days later, and it took up two hours since we were also trying to get to know some of the IEP students. The next thing we did was eat lunch in the ARA with some of

the IEP students. The first time it was Jessica and Charity who ate with them for an hour. The second time it was Quintin and Charity for an hour, and the last time it was Yue Yue and Hannah for an hour. This gave us three more hours. Before, during, and after two chapel services, Jessica and Yue Yue spent time with some of the IEP students. They came early to sit and talk with them, and they also stayed around to talk to them afterwards. During the actual service, they helped the IEP students take notes of the service since they are required to do so. Then one evening, Hannah went over to Yue Yue's house, which is off campus and located around where some IEP students live. They spent two hours hanging out and talking with the IEP students that came to Yue Yue's house.

Team iPhone created a blog and then updated it every so often to meet the requirement of five blog updates; however this process could be strengthened. We understood that the significance of the blog was to communicate with an outside audience about our endeavor, but there was no outside audience reading our blog. So, the incentive to update more than five times was not there. There was even a time in this process that we forgot we had blog. After discussing how the blog could have been better we decided that ultimately if we were more intentional about it, it would have been great. Some ideas we had included the following; more pictures of our time with the IEP community, individual bios of *Team iPhone* group members, and individual bios of the international students that we have become acquainted with. For examples of blog posts, see Appendix B.

In an interview we conducted with three Chinese IEP students we concluded that, while at OBU, the international students experience homesickness, the IEP is very difficult, and interactions with American students consist of discussing the bible. Boyu Xie, Ziang Wang, and

Kehui Wang, the Chinese international students interviewed, said that they think OBU is a good university, people are very nice, and they have enjoyed their experiences very much. When asked about how they like the IEP, all three agreed that the program is too hard. Ziang and Kehui seemed to answer the questions similarly. Boyu however, differed in most of his opinions saying that he didn't like the IEP and he has never been homesick.

The IEP students do not tend to spend time with other nationalities outside of class time. In the interview, we asked the students why this was, and Ziang said that it was hard to spend time with them because English is their common language and they "just can't understand one another" (personal communication, October 10, 2012). In an interview with Jessi Masterson, an American student worker in the IEP, she said that the interaction among different nationalities in the program did not leave the classroom. She also suggested that our group interview students on campus who have already completed the IEP. Interaction with American students on campus is also limited and according to an article in *The Student Union* this is because American students tend to believe that international students isolate themselves.

After the interview with the Chinese students we decided to spend time with students that were not Chinese. Some of the nationalities we were able to 'get to know' were Chilean and Brazilian. The Chilean and Brazilian IEP students seemed to spend time with some American students outside of class. Although most of their American friends were either from the same sports team or worked in the IEP program, they did seem to spend time with American students regularly.

While 'getting to know' the IEP community, the head of the department Keely was very difficult to contact. This was because she was very busy and even left in the middle of the

semester. This was a problem we were not expecting. However, we did get into contact with the new IEP department head and we were able to spend some time with the IEP students inside their classroom.

A study conducted by Poyrazli (2007) concluded that students who perceive themselves to be discriminated against experience severe homesickness. Although the international students that we interviewed did not show any signs of being negatively discriminated against, they are more than likely recognized as different on campus. Furthermore, Poyrazli points out that the effects of discrimination have an effect on international student's identification and this could explain why "international students seek out identification with other international students" of their own culture (p. 267).

The article by Poyrazli (2007) suggested that perceptions of discrimination on a college campus cannot be eliminated, but programs could be implemented to reduce these perceptions. The IEP on OBU has proven to be successful, however from the research we conducted there were improvements that could be made in the community among different nationalities in the program.

After spending three hours with the IEP community, *Team iPhone* resolved to find the central problem within the community and then seek to find ways to solve the problem. To evaluate the problem, a Procedural Model of Problem Solving (P-MOPS) was conducted. On October 25, 2012 we met in the library and began with the first step of P-Mops which is *problem description and analysis*. We discussed the following problems within the community; Keely Robertson (director of the IEP) recently quit, homesickness among international students, the IEP students have no interaction with other nationalities outside of class, and cultural differences.

After discussing all of these problems, team iPhone concluded that the central problem for the IEP community was that there seemed to be a disconnect between the IEP students and campus.

Next, we completed the second step of P-MOPS, *generating and elaborating on possible solutions*. There were many possible solutions that team iPhone explored, one being that student organizations could be more vocal to the IEP, specifically about the different activities/events on campus. Different ideas for this included: making posters in the students' language, and someone going to the IEP location and talking to the students face-to-face. The final solution discussed was to establish a committee on campus that specifically focused on connecting the IEP to campus. The committee would go to different organization co-chairs and discuss how they could involve the students in their organization and advertise specifically to the IEP students.

The next step we conducted was *evaluating possible solutions*. The positives and negatives were discussed for each of the solutions that were recommended. After this discussion we completed step four of P-MOPS (*consensus decision making*) and decided that the best possible solution was to form a committee that focused on ways to better involve and connect the IEP students on campus would be the best solution to the central problem. The committee would not only discuss and research the problem more thoroughly, but they would approach different student organizations about the issue to make them more aware.

To *implement the solution chosen*, the group decided to first talk to the *spiritual life committee* on campus about forming an IEP committee with a diverse group of people (professors, staff members, students). If the spiritual life committee was not able to help with forming an IEP committee, we would talk to Dean Skaggs about forming a committee. If Dean

Skaggs could not form a committee or offer other suggestions, *Team iPhone* would ultimately act as the IEP committee.

After conducting P-MOPS, *Team iPhone* wrote out the process in detail and had it evaluated by an outside source. The outside source suggested that our group revise two of the steps in our P-MOPS; *problem description and analysis* and *consensus decision making*. We concluded that the problems analyzed were based on our own observations. We also concluded that the observation about the IEP students having no interaction with other nationalities outside of class was based on the perception of the Chinese students. We decided it was best to take on problems within the IEP program from the perception of the actually IEP students as well as from the perception of students that were not Chinese. After spending more time with the IEP students (Brazilians and Chileans), team iPhone concluded that the central problem for the IEP community was that there still seemed to be a disconnect between the IEP students and campus. For a complete description of *Team iPhone's* P-MOPS (original and revised), see Appendix G.

Implementing the solution did not go as planned. Charity was a part of the spiritual life committee and the meetings were cancelled for an entire month, so *Team iPhone* resorted to contacting Dean Skaggs. However, Dean Skaggs never emailed the group back. Consequently, we decided to act as the committee *might* and we announced free events that the IEP students could attend during the students' class time. Eventually, the spiritual life committee met and Charity was able to discuss the possibility of forming a committee that focused on benefiting the IEP.

Part II: The Group Processes

Team iPhone met nine times as a group. Every group member was able to attend all of the meetings except for the meeting on November 26th; Yue Yue and Hannah did not attend the meeting. Typically, meetings were held in the front room of the Oklahoma Baptist University (OBU) library.

Normally, group meetings lasted an hour or more. We did not keep minutes, but Jessica kept an agenda and meeting notes. Jessica was responsible for both the agenda and the meeting notes. However, the group was not official about the agenda and meeting notes. Despite that, after meetings, Jessica would email the group about what was discussed in the meeting and upcoming dates.

Before a typical meeting began, discussion among group members consisted of small talk about classes and other miscellaneous topics. Then, Charity would begin the meeting and Jessica would take meeting notes. The meetings consisted of talking through whatever was on the agenda for that meeting and accomplishing the task at hand. Occasionally discussion would shift off topic, but Charity would always remind the group of the current task. Once we had completed what was set out to be accomplished, the meeting was adjourned and Jessica would send a follow up email.

Fantasy is defined as, “a statement not pertaining to the here-and-now of the group that offers a creative and meaningful interpretation of events and meets a group’s psychological or rhetorical need” (p. 154). Fantasy theme refers to the actual content of a group’s fantasy. *Team iPhone* would often discuss topics that did not pertain to the group’s task at hand. It was a norm

to start the meetings with discussing how busy everyone was. All of the members are a communications major or minor and we shared one or more classes together other than *group discussion*, so another topic of conversation would be about the workload in the shared classes.

Several times when we discussed cultural differences between our group and the Intensive English Program (IEP) students, Yue Yue would tell us about awful encounters with American students. We would often ask Yue Yue culture questions and laugh about our differences. Whenever we were working on an assignment for *group discussion* that we did not understand or did not want to do, we would often complain about the class or complain about how the assignment was confusing or how we did not like it.

When *Team iPhone* first started having meetings, there was some primary tension due to the fact that we were a new team with a new assignment. We were all at least acquainted with one another, and some of us had been in groups together before. The early meetings were filled with a lot of agreement and no one causing any secondary tension. We all went along with what was said and caused very little conflict. We were trying to get used to each other's communication style, thus causing everyone to be more quiet and timid. We all had the mindset of just wanting to get the assignment done. However, this changed when the assignments grew to be more strenuous.

As the meeting progressed, we became more comfortable with each other. We were not afraid to voice our opinion on certain subjects or items. Secondary tension occurred within our group when we were trying to upload the video of our Face-to-Face meeting onto Moodlerooms. OBU was having problems with the Internet, so firstly we could not upload the meeting to YouTube. Secondly, once we got the Internet to work again, the video file far exceeded the limit

to what YouTube would allow to be uploaded. During this time, Charity and Quintin experienced tension while worrying to get this assignment uploaded before the deadline. The assignment was struggling to get uploaded due to all of the previously mentioned factors. Charity was also experiencing other tensions with waiting for other assigned portions to be turned in to her as well.

The event that occurred during *Team iPhone*'s secondary tension instigated the leadership emergence. Charity emerged as the group's leader because she realized that turning in assignments on time was crucial and someone needed to take charge from that point on. Charity was already the most talkative within the group meetings before her noticeable leadership emerged; she often led the conversations and kept the group on task.

In addition to the leadership skill of leading conversation, Charity had many other leadership qualities that influenced her leadership emergence. She was a high self-monitor, she listened to every one's opinions and was very flexible with our group. If something needed to be changed or needed to happen she figured out the best way to do it. She helped us stay focused and on task in group meetings. Charity was also organized and would text us about meetings and assignments.

Ultimately, Charity's leadership style tended to be *autocratic*. When there was a task that needed to be accomplished, because there was limited time, Charity would make a suggestion about how to go about accomplishing the task and everyone in the group always agreed. Eventually, this way of accomplishing tasks evolved into Charity commanding each group member on what they needed to do specifically to accomplish each task. Our group could not have functioned as well as it did without her.

Team iPhone had a few general norms as well as role-specific norms. We would always meet in the same place every time we had a group meeting; in the very front of the library. Jessica would always take meeting notes on her cell phone. Charity would generally lead conversation and make sure that the group stayed on task. Whenever there was a question about the IEP students, the group would look to Yue Yue for answers. Quintin would talk, but when we discussed more task related issues he would just listen. *Team iPhone's* main communication tool was the group message application on our iPhone's. If Charity did not text the group about meetings, it was a norm for Yue Yue to text Charity and remind her to let everyone know about when we would be meeting. It was also a norm for Hannah to show up late or last to every group meeting.

Overall the climate (emotional and relational atmosphere) of our group was very neutral. We all worked together well and we all liked each other. Although there were some conflicts about task related issues, there was never a conflict about relational issues. We would often talk about how we really like our group as compared to groups that we have been in in the past. We say that our climate was neutral because we were not best friends, but we did enjoy our time together. When we met we would rarely talk about anything other than the task at hand.

Galanes and Adams (2013) explained that there are phases that functioning groups always go through. In the *antecedent phase* the individual group members bring their different personalities and their own communication traits to the group dynamic. The first meeting is always a little awkward, and the group can figure out a little bit about every ones personalities. It can be easy to tell if a person is shy or really outgoing. Not every group is the same and there are also different cultures and backgrounds. In *Team iPhone's* antecedent phase the group learned

that Charity liked to talk, while the rest of the group members were listeners. We were all polite and did not want to step on each other's toes. Yue yue is also from a different country so we talked about her culture and asked her many questions about it.

The *anticipatory phase* describes the initial expectations members have of each other and the group. The expectations during this phase help set goals that need to be obtained during the group work (Galanes and Adams, 2013). *Team iPhone* had a couple of expectations during the anticipatory phase. We expected to get along with each other and work together really well. We also expected this project to be easy and for the tasks to be easy.

The *encounter phase* is when the expectations of the anticipatory phase meet the realities for the group. This is the time when groups have to create or adjust to accommodate problems that have been encountered (Galanes and Adams, 2013). When our group reached the encounter phase we discovered that this project was going to be more work than we thought. It was more time consuming and more effort than we anticipated. We discovered this during the event that occurred during secondary tension (as described in earlier paragraphs).

During the *assimilation phase* the group members are fully integrated into the group and its structures. The members of the group are comfortable with each other and each member knows their task within the group (Galanes and Adams, 2013). Our group became more comfortable with each other towards the beginning of our group huddles in class and after a few group meetings. We knew what each person could contribute to the group after the secondary tension had occurred.

The *exit phase* occurs when the group's responsibilities come to an end and the group inevitably disbands (Galanes and Adams, 2013). This phase happened for *Team iPhone* very easily. Once the requirements for the project were finished, we said goodbye and that was it. The group members all agreed that if we ever saw each other again then we would talk and be friendly, but nothing more than that.

Throughout the process of serving the IEP community, *Team iPhone* experienced conflict. However, there was little to no conflict in the relational area of the group. The area where *Team iPhone* experienced the most conflict was with scheduling. We are all busy college students so it was difficult to find times to meet that worked for all of us. A good example of this was the meeting on December 2, 2012. Quintin and Jessica often went home on the weekends, so the meeting had to be held later in the evening so that everyone could attend. We also had to take into consideration that Hannah had to meet with another group that night. Charity group-texted us that day and we worked out what time everyone could meet and decided to meet at 8:30. For this problem we used *collaboration* to find a time that worked for the whole group.

Another problem was scheduling a time to meet with Keely (the director of the IEP). We emailed her several times and never received a reply, and then we found out that she was leaving Oklahoma Baptist University in the middle of the semester for reasons that were never discovered. Accommodating to this conflict was essential because our group had to schedule times to go to the IEP classrooms to complete volunteer hours with the students. For that reason, we met with the IEP students outside of the classroom until contact was made with the new IEP director.

A task conflict occurred when the Project Plan, Gantt chart, and audio recorded meeting were all due online on Friday at 5:00 p.m. The internet was down and it was already late afternoon on Friday. So, the group collaborated on how to turn the assignments in on time. Secondary tension transpired during this conflict.

Another task conflict took place when an assignment had to be completed that required our group to find articles that related to our community. Hannah's grandmother was in the hospital, so she was unable to complete her part of the assignment. Hannah did not contact the group to let them know why she could not complete her part of the assignment, so Charity went ahead and completed it for her. Rather than confront her about it, Charity avoided the conflict and just completed Hannah's part of the assignment. The situation was ultimately dealt with properly because Hannah's grandmother was in the hospital and the rest of the group was unaware.

To assess how each of the group members a part of *Team iPhone* personal characteristics and personality showed up in group meetings and deliverables, each member took five individual assessment tests. One test that was taking was the Meyer-Briggs test. After more online research about what the results of the test meant, the group members all felt that the results of this test were accurate.

Quintin (ISFP), was the only introverted individual in the group. His personal assessments claimed that he was not one to be active or talkative when in group settings. These results were accurate because most of the time he would sit in the meetings and not say anything as parts of the project were discussed. Even when the group had discussions via group-text on the iPhone, he would rarely respond unless the discussion required him to explain when he could

or could not meet with the group. When discussion was off topic, he seemed to talk a lot more, which related to his feeling, or friendly characteristics. He was willing to talk a lot about subjects that were off-topic, but when on-topic, he mostly sat and listened while gathering information and only chiming in when he really had an opinion or suggestion on something. For Quintin, actions speak louder than words.

The results of Yue Yue's personal assessments (ESFJ) indicated that she enjoyed being with others, liked to talk to people, and felt confident in her communication ability. This was true for Yue Yue because she always shared her ideas with other group members without apprehension. While the group worked on the project, she would tell group members her interesting cultural experiences from the past. Moreover, Yue Yue believed that sharing interesting facts with the group members could maintain the relationship with each other. Yue Yue was very committed and would always ask Charity what she could do to benefit the group.

Similar to Yue Yue, Jessica (ESFJ) was also very committed to the group. This was indicated by her consistency in group meeting attendance and also in her consistency to email and take meeting notes. Her behaviors in the meetings were very relaxed, but still focused on getting things done. Jessica's behavior reflects that she's outgoing in the meetings just like her Meyer-Briggs indicates. Jessica participated quite a bit and threw ideas out to everyone when she had input. Jessica had a job (taking meeting notes and updating the group) and she did her job well.

Charity (ENFP) was the group's emergent leader. The results of the Meyers-Briggs test indicated that Charity was a *perceiver*; therefore, she was not very organized. However, she took on the role of a *judger* by making sure the group was well organized. After much research on

what it means to be an *ENFP*, the more Charity realized the results were very accurate. Charity is an impassioned catalyst meaning that she influences people because of her excitement about the task at hand. An example of this occurred during the P-MOPS meeting the group had. After the group discussed implementing the solution for the IEP, Charity became overly excited about helping the IEP students. Consequently, the rest of the group became excited as well.

Hannah's (ENFJ) individual assessment tests were fairly accurate, especially in a group setting. She was an extrovert in the group and liked to keep things moving. She also liked to be organized, but was also flexible when the circumstances would change. She had an intuitive feeling and when it came to conflict she was compromising and accommodating. Many members in the group were very similar in this way, which helped the group function, and accomplish tasks. She was not necessarily quiet, but she listened to what everyone has to say. She voiced her opinion when she felt it was necessary.

Overall, the experience of *Team iPhone's* group work was good. However our experience could have been much better. The most challenging aspect of working with the group was meeting the group project requirements. Meeting with the IEP students did not go as planned because the programs director never stayed in contact with us and then she eventually left. Despite that, there were five busy college students in the group, so sometimes it was hard to find time to meet. Also, when we did meet, we absolutely had to stay on task because we only had a limited amount of time.

Our group never had relational problems, we all enjoyed our time together, however, we believe that our group could have been better if we had more time to focus on the actual project. When there is a high sense of commitment and motivation within a group, more than likely the

outcome will be great. *Team iPhone* had a high commitment and motivation to get the project done, nevertheless, this was only because there was a commitment and motivation to complete the requirements for the *Group Discussion* class.

Ultimately, our group acquired many valuable skills through this project, one being how to look at a situation and find the *central* problem procedurally (P-MOPs). Furthermore, if we could have done anything different this semester it would have been to spend more time with our chosen community early on in the semester. We presume that if we spent time with the IEP students before our assigned interview, we might have been more committed and motivated to the project. Therefore, for future groups, we will make sure to look over all of our requirements and have a thorough understanding of what our proposed project entails. We will also make sure to somehow obtain a high motivation for the actual project.

References

- Galanes, G. J., Adams K. (2013). *Effective group discussion: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Hillyard, L., Reppen, R., & Vásquez, C. (2007). Bringing the outside world into an intensive English programme. *ELT Journal: English Language Teachers Journal*, 61(2), 126-134.
doi:10.1093/elt/ccm005
- Poyrazli, S., Lopez, M.D. (2007). An exploratory study of perceived discrimination and homesickness: A comparison of international students and American students. *Journal of Psychology*, 141(3). 263.
- Stahl, J. (2012, June 19). Why aren't Americans and international students becoming friends. *The Student Union*. Retrieved October 12, 2012, from <http://blogs.voanews.com>.

Appendix A

APCM 2303 Group Contract**GROUP NAME:** Team iPhone**Group Members and contact information listed below**

Full Name	Telephone#	OBU email	Back-up email	Contact preference
1. Charity Jernigan	918-527-6299	charity.jernigan@okbu.edu	charityanne_j@yahoo.com	texting
2. Quintin Magruder	580-504-8879	quintin.magruder@okbu.edu	quintin.magruder@my.okbu.edu	texting
3. Yue Liu	405-585-1356	yue.liu@okbu.edu	gunny320@hotmail.com	texting
4. Jessica Rose	405-245-9097	jessica.rose@okbu.edu	jesrose@cox.net	texting
5. Hannah Ashley	918-770-5956	hannah.ashley@okbu.edu	ou4hba@aol.com	texting

1) Contact Procedure:

- a. How will your team members contact each other (e.g., texting, gmail chat, skype phone calls, email)?

Our team will contact each other by texting and email. If either of those methods fails then we will just Facebook message each other.

- b. How many times a week/month/semester will your team members contact each other?

We will come five minutes early to class to talk about how things are going and then meet or talk two times every week. We will keep each other accountable and on task with what needs to be done.

- c. Who is responsible for initiating contact every week/every 2 weeks?

Hannah Ashley is the person responsible for initiating contact every week.

- d. What is the back-up procedure should this person forget to initiate contact?

Charity Jernigan is the back-up person for initiating contact if Hannah does not fulfill her position.

- e. What telecommunication vehicle will your team use (e.g., Skype, Google+, Yahoo chat)?

Our group will use Skype as our telecommunication vehicle.

2) Meeting procedure & initial role assignments:

- a. When and where will you meet face to face?

We will meet in the afternoons on the weekdays and mostly be working on our project in the GC or the library.

- b. Who will create the agenda BEFORE the meeting?

Hannah Ashley will create the agenda for the tasks that need to be done during the meetings.

- c. If team members do not attend meetings, how will those missing be held accountable for their lack of participation?

Everyone will come to the meetings and if they have a legitimate reason as to why they cannot attend the meeting then we will send them the notes and they have to email what their completed task to us.

- d. Who will provide the written record of meeting notes?

Jessica Rose will be taking notes during the meetings and keep them organized and neat.

- e. Who will be the back-up person to take notes?

If Jessica cannot take notes then Quintin will be taking the notes instead.

- f. Who will make sure that the team meets assignment deliverables and deadlines?

Charity is in charge of making sure our deadlines are met and that we have everything we need to complete our project.

3) Grades:

- a. What will happen to members who do not contribute to teamwork?

We will all talk as a group and see if there is anyway we can figure out a plan to where everyone is participating. If it happens again then we will vote them off the group. Our main goal is for everyone to participate evenly and if that doesn't happen then we will talk it through. Open and strong communication is important in our group and if something is not completed then we will just talk to that person and ask what we as a group can do to help get it done.

- b. Will team members be deducted points?

Team members will be deducted points if they are not contributing to our group.

- 4) **Consistent problems in groups:** Many times, one or two people of the team do a lot of the work. For instance, the secretary who sends out the agenda also might take meeting notes and work without sleep to complete the Powerpoint presentation. This becomes tiring, overwhelming, and frustrating, and ultimately produces conflict and resentment. What will you do to prevent this from occurring? Everybody will have their own assigned jobs and everyone has to complete their own tasks on time. It will be split up evenly, but we will all help each other at the same time. We will do whatever it takes to complete our project together with the right teamwork. Communication is key in the success in our group; if communication is not strong in our group then we will all suffer from it. There obviously will be some tension if tasks are completed later than we like, but instead of dwelling on the problem we should just fix it so it does not happen next time. Everyone makes mistakes because they are not perfect, so being specific and detailed will hopefully help with everyone doing the same amount of work and not being confused about the tasks at hand.
- 5) **The big conflict:** At what point will the team call for a “tribal council” meeting? If a tribal council meeting is necessary then we will talk as a group without the person and come to a conclusion. We will talk about expectations for the project at the beginning of the week and talk each day about what is going on and what needs to be done. So if the tasks are not being completed then as a group we need to decide how to get it done and try and help the person struggling in our group. If it does not look like the team member does not care about the

project then we will talk to everyone about the situation. We want to bring positive criticism, but if not everyone is participating then we will just have to figure out another solution.

Appendix B

Team iPhone

Thursday, November 29, 2012

Announcement Time!

After talking to several different organizations of campus about implementing the IEP students into future events, Team iPhone compiled a list of free events on campus that we could announce in the IEP classrooms. So, on Tuesday, Nov. 27th, Team iPhone did just that.

All five of the group members met with the head of the IEP and he thanked us for what we were doing. Then we went around to the four classrooms, passed out a list of events and invited the students to the free on campus events and we answered any questions that they had.



Blog Archive

- ▼ 2012 (4)
 - ▼ November (2)
 - Announcement Time!
 - Problem and Solution
 - October (1)
 - September (1)

About Me



Team iPhone

HELLO! We are a small group of students at Oklahoma Baptist University, and we have created this blog to keep you updated on a semester long project (you can read about this further in our first blog post). Our group consists of five humans, one young man, and four young women. We call ourselves Team iPhone, because we all own an iPhone, and to help you put a face to the name, we posted a picture; Top row, left to right: Quintin Magruder (Senior), Yue Liu (Senior). Bottom row, left to right: Jessica

Know the Community!

This semester (Fall 2012) at Oklahoma Baptist University, *Team iPhone* will be endeavoring to understand a section of the campus and find solutions to better the experiences of that community.

At this point, we (Team iPhone) have not decided what community we will be observing and serving, but we have a few general ideas. Yue Yue suggested getting to know the IEP (Intensive English Program) community on campus, which contains international students, intensely learning english. Our only hesitation about working with this particular community is that Yue Yue was in this program 3 years ago! We wanted to serve a community that no one is a part of, and Yue Yue technically isn't a part of this community anymore.

If we do not decide to work with the IEP community, we plan on learning about the janitorial staff on campus, and possibly work with them to improve their community in anyway they need us too. With whatever community we choose to observe, IEP or janitorial staff, we will an hour every week with that community.

We know that you are sitting on the edge of your seat in anticipation of knowing what community we decide to work with, *so stay tuned*, because we will be making our decision shortly!

More information coming soon!

About Me



Team iPhone

HELLO! We are a small group of students at Oklahoma Baptist University, and we have created this blog to keep you updated on a semester long project (you can read about this further in our first blog post). Our group consists of five humans, one young man, and four young women. We call ourselves Team iPhone, because we all own an iPhone, and to help you put a face to the name, we posted a picture; Top row, left to right: Quintin Magruder (Senior), Yue Liu (Senior). Bottom row, left to right: Jessica Rose (Sophomore), Hannah Ashley (Junior), Charity Jernigan (Junior). We are excited about this project, and we hope that you are excited too! HERE WE GO!

Appendix C

Meeting Agenda and Meeting Notes

September 6:

Agenda:

- Talk about ideas we've had for our project.
- Then talk about blog. The ideas and goals we have for it.
- Then start creating our account.
- Then go over what we want to put in our blog.
- The proof read and make sure that everyone knows what is going on.

Charity, Hannah, Quintin, and Yue Yue, and Jessica met in the library at 7:00 p.m. We started creating our blog using Blogger, but we called Dr. Lowe to ask if we could switch to using Tumblr instead. We brainstormed ideas for our community. The ideas we came up with were the IEP students or OBU staff. Our only concern with observing the IEP students is that Yue Yue is familiar with the program and we were not sure if that would make us ineligible to work with that group. Charity had to leave a few minutes early for a previous engagement, so we decided to wait to upload the blog to Moodlerooms until she could look over it since she has blogged a little before. We continued working on the blog until about 8:15 when we decided to call it a night.

September 12:

Agenda: Complete Project Plan

Charity, Hannah, Quintin, Yue Yue, and Jessica met in the library at 5:00. We all helped answer the questions for the Project Plan while Charity typed it up on her laptop. When we were almost finished with the Project Plan, Hannah decided she would figure out how the Gantt chart is

supposed to be done and she started working on that. We finished the Project Plan and Hannah said she would finish the Gantt chart later when she had time. The meeting was adjourned at 6:00.

September 19:

Agenda: Figure out how to record telecommunication meeting.

Charity, Hannah, Quintin, Yue Yue, and Jessica met in the library at 8:00 and we started talking about how to do the telecommunication meeting. We also discussed how to slice up the audio of the face-to-face meeting and how to upload it to YouTube. Quintin worked on that while the rest of us talked to Yue Yue about if she had met with Keeley and what we can do with the students when we first meet them. It was decided that we could bring some food and play some icebreaker games. We decided that our first meeting with them would be next week sometime. We adjourned the meeting at 9:00.

September 20:

Agenda: Record Telecommunication Meeting

Charity, Hannah, Quintin, Yue Yue, and Jessica met in the library at 3:45 and set up Charity's laptop to record us. Charity went to a different room in the library and the rest of us called Charity from Jessica's phone and discussed when to meet with Keeley and basically just reiterated the notes from the previous day for the telecommunication meeting recording. We were done within ten minutes.

October 25:

Agenda: Talk about paper.

Charity, Quintin, Yue Yue, and Jessica met in our usual spot in the library at 3:30. Hannah showed up at 3:40. We reviewed the graded interview and data analysis to see how we could write better for this paper. We each picked a step to talk about in the paper and then started generating ideas. Yue Yue had a big part in telling us what she liked and didn't like about IEP and how it is different now than from when she was in it. We disbanded at 4:40.

November 15:

Agenda: Discuss when to meet with community and what to do.

Charity, Quintin, Yue Yue, and Jessica showed up at 9:00 in our classroom. Hannah came at 9:08. We talked about when to meet with our IEP students again and what to do with them. We discussed having a get-to-know-you party for them and provide food and drinks. We also discussed taking them to the cafeteria and eating with them there. We are going to talk to Dean Skaggs about implementing our solution after Hannah emails him. Charity is going to talk to her Spiritual Life committee about the solution. We are also going to sit with the IEP students during chapel on November 28. The meeting ended at 9:20.

November 20:

Agenda: Go over PMOPS critique.

Charity, Quintin, Yue Yue, and Jessica met in the classroom at 9:00. Hannah came at 9:10. We discussed Dr. Lowe's commentary on our PMOPS solution. The meeting ended at 9:20.

November 26:

Agenda: Talk about going to IEP classroom and telling them about events.

Charity, Quintin, and Jessica met in the library at 3:15. Yue Yue could not make the meeting and Hannah never showed up. We discussed what we will tell the IEP students tomorrow when we go to tell them about campus events coming up. We also discussed our PMOPS and rewrote our paper and went into thorough detail about the different problems and the different solutions. We adjourned at 4:00.

December 2:

Agenda: Work on paper for project and presentation.

Charity, Quintin, Yue Yue, Hannah and Jessica met in the library at 8:30. We started working together on the guidelines for the paper and started putting the paper together. This meeting was all about figuring out what to say on the paper and finding terms from the book that we could use to describe our whole group process. We also worked on the PowerPoint and discussed who would speak when. We disbanded at 9:40.

December 3:

Agenda: Finish up paper and organize and practice presentation.

Charity, Yue Yue, Hannah and Jessica met in the library at 7:00. Quintin was meeting with Dr. Ellis about his research paper, so he came late at 7:45. We looked at the PowerPoint that we had previously put together and discussed who was going to talk about which slides. We disbanded this meeting at 8:40.

Appendix D

Know the Community Project Plan

- 1) What is the chosen community? Describe the community.

The community that we have chosen to observe is the Intensive English Program at Oklahoma Baptist University. This community embodies around thirty international students' whose first language is not English. We do not know the exact number of students or countries represented as right now, but a number of students are from Brazil, Argentina, Chile, South Africa, China, Korea, and Japan.

- 2) Describe why you chose the community.

We chose this community firsthand because Yue Yue suggested it. Yue Yue is familiar with the program because she was a part of it in 2008. We think it will be fun to work with a community of people that are around the same age as us. Our immediate observation is that the students are unfamiliar with American culture as well as culture at OBU; this is one way we believe we can go about serving the IEP students.

- 3) What are your back-up communities should this one not pan out? What is your "deadline" for deciding to use your back-up community?

If we cannot gain access to our first choice community by September 20th, we will use the Hope House, which is located in downtown Shawnee.

- 4) Explain how and when you will spend time with the community.

We have not gained access into the community yet, but Yue Yue has emailed Keeley Robertson, the head of the IEP to talk to her about the possibility of working with the international students. The plan is to meet with Keeley on September 13th. After we have access

to the community we plan on spending 1 hour a week with the IEP for 10 weeks. Exactly what we will be doing and the time of day that we will meet with the students is not yet set because we still have not had contact with Keeley. We are thinking right now that we will be helping with homework.

- 5) If you have done interviews or spent time with the community, what are you noticing right now about them? If you have NOT spent time/interviewed them, what are your pre-conceived notions about them?

We have not spent time with the IEP students, but we all have preconceived notions about them. The students don't speak English very well, they could be homesick (missing family, missing food, missing normality), they may be having difficulty adjusting to the culture here, they may be shy, and they may not have many American friends.

- 6) Right now, which team members are emerging as leader(s), boundary spanners, and information gatherers?

Charity is emerging as a team leader. She usually keeps communication at the meetings on the task at hand. Yue Yue is serving as the group boundary spanner. She stays in contact with the head of the IEP and imports and exports information about the IEP that is relevant to our group's success. All of the group members serve as information gatherers. For instance, everyone has a specific task to complete when we meet, so information must be gathered for that specific task. The main information gatherer is Hannah. She always reminds us of meetings and the due dates of assignments.

Appendix E

Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	Assigned To	% Comp
Meeting to start working on project plan	1 hour	09/12/12	09/12/12		
Work on project plan	2 hours	09/12/12	09/14/12		
Recording of meeting and meeting notes	1 hour	09/12/12	09/14/12		
Meeting with IEP director	1 hour	09/17/12	09/17/12		
Work with IEP community	1 hour	09/19/12	09/19/12		
Meeting to talk and record	1 hour	09/19/12	09/19/12		
Update blog	1 hour	09/19/12	09/19/12	Charity	
Turn in telecommunication and meeting notes	2 hours	09/19/12	09/21/12		
Working with the IEP community	1 hour	09/26/12	09/26/12		
Meeting to discuss notes and talk about the IEP program	1 hour	09/26/12	09/26/12		
Turn in meeting notes	1 hour	09/26/12	09/28/12		
Working with IEP community	1 hour	10/03/12	10/03/12		
Meeting to work on analysis	2 hours	10/03/12	10/03/12		
Turn in Individual assessment, analysis, and meeting notes	2 hours	10/01/12	10/05/12		
Update blog	1 hour	10/03/12	10/03/12	Charity	
Working with the IEP community	1 hour	10/10/12	10/10/12		
Meeting to collect data and discuss notes	1 hour	10/10/12	10/10/12		
Interview with the IEP program and type paper	2 hours	10/08/12	10/12/12		
Working with the IEP community	1 hour	10/17/12	10/17/12		
Meeting to discuss notes	1 hour	10/17/12	10/17/12		
Update blog	1 hour	10/17/12	10/17/12	Charity	
Working with the IEP community	1 hour	10/24/12	10/24/12		
Meeting to discuss and work on P-MOPs	1 hour	10/24/12	10/24/12		
Complete and turn in P-MOPs	2 hours	10/24/12	10/26/12		
Working with the IEP community	1 hour	10/31/12	10/31/12		
Meeting to discuss notes	1 hour	10/31/12	10/31/12		
Update blog	1 hour	10/31/12	10/31/12	Charity	
Working with the IEP community	1 hour	11/07/12	11/07/12		
Meeting to discuss notes and work on portfolio	1 hour	11/07/12	11/07/12		
Working with the IEP community	1 hour	11/14/12	11/14/12		
Meeting to discuss notes and work on portfolio	1 hour	11/14/12	11/14/12		
Update blog	1 hour	11/14/12	11/14/12	Charity	
Working with the IEP community	1 hour	11/21/12	11/21/12		
Meeting to collect notes and start finishing up the project	2 hours	11/21/12	11/21/12		
Finish up portfolio and get ready to present our project	5 hour	11/22/12	11/28/12		
Present our project	1 hour	11/29/12	12/06/12		
Turn in project portfolio	1 hour	12/12/12	12/12/12		

Appendix F

Interview Data & Collection (Revised)

Oklahoma Baptist University offers an Intensive English Program (IEP) in which international students over the age of 16 can take English classes to prepare for undergraduate or graduate level classes. The countries represented in the OBU IEP are; Albania, Bosnia, Brazil, Chile, China, France, Japan, Italy, Korea, Mexico, Spain, and Vietnam. In our endeavor to “get to know” the IEP community, our group has spent a total of three hours with a Chinese group of IEP students, interviewed three Chinese students, and researched other intensive English programs.

In the interview we conducted with three Chinese IEP students we concluded that, while at OBU, the international students experience homesickness, the IEP is very difficult, and interactions with American students consist of discussing the bible. Boyu Xie, Ziang Wang, and Kehui Wang, the Chinese international students interviewed, said that they think OBU is a good university, people are very nice, and they have enjoyed their experiences very much. When asked about how they like the IEP, all three agreed that the program is too hard. Ziang and Kehui seemed to answer the questions similarly, Boyu however, differed in most of his opinions saying that he didn't like the IEP and he has never been homesick.

The IEP students do not tend to spend time with other nationalities outside of class time. In the interview, we asked the students why this was, and Ziang said that it was hard to spend time with them because English is their common language and they “just can't understand one another” (personal communication, October 10, 2012). In an interview with Jessi Masterson, an American student worker in the IEP, she said that the interaction among different nationalities in

the program did not leave the classroom. She also suggested that our group interview students on campus who have already completed the IEP. Interaction with American students on campus is also limited and according to an article in *The Student Union* this is because American students tend to believe that international students isolate themselves.

Although Boyu said that he has never been homesick before, a study conducted by Poyrazli (2007) concluded that students who perceive themselves to be discriminated against experience severe homesickness. Although the international students that we interviewed did not show any signs of being negatively discriminated against, they are more than likely recognized as different on campus. Furthermore, Poyrazli points out that the effects of discrimination have an effect on international students identification and this could explain why “international students seek out identification with other international students” of their own culture (p. 267).

The article by Poyrazli (2007) suggested that perceptions of discrimination on a college campus cannot be eliminated, but programs could be implemented to reduce these perceptions. Hillyard (2007) conducted a study on how to better implement intensive english programs to benefit the international students involved. One program that the professors in this study implemented is what they call “service-learning” in which the international students participated in community service projects to learn “authentic English” and interact with different types of people (p. 127).

The IEP on OBU has proven to be successful, however from the research we conducted there are improvements that can be made in the community among different nationalities in the program. The program implemented in the study by Hillyard (2007) is a great example of how a

program could be implemented to not only improve the English of international students, but also give the international students a healthy interaction with others.

Appendix G

P-MOPS Analysis (Original)

Step 1: Problem Description and Analysis

Potential problems in the Intensive English Program (IEP) at Oklahoma Baptist University (OBU) include the following; Keely Robertson (director of the IEP) recently quit, homesickness among international students, the IEP students have no interaction with other nationalities outside of class, cultural differences, etc. After discussing all of these problems, team iPhone concluded that the central problem for the IEP community was that there seemed to be a disconnect between the IEP students and campus. We also concluded that there were many reasons for this disconnect, but the central reason being that American students generally believe that the international students like to isolate themselves. American students are not aware of international students. Ultimately, how can team iPhone increase the awareness of international students at OBU?

Step 2: Generating and Elaborating on Possible Solutions

There were many possible solutions that team iPhone explored. One being that student organizations could be more vocal to the IEP specifically about the different activities/events on campus. Different ideas for this included; making posters in the students' language, and someone going to the IEP location and talking to the students face-to-face. Another solution could be that the IEP could adopt a type of "service learning" program for the IEP students. This would include putting the IEP students in groups with other nationalities to complete a service project to possibly enhance interaction with different nationalities outside of class. The final solution discussed was to establish a committee on campus that specifically focused on connecting the

IEP to campus. The committee would go to different organization co-chairs and discuss how they could involve the students in their organization and advertise specifically to the IEP students.

Step 3: Evaluating Possible Solutions

Team iPhone discussed the positives and negatives of all of the possible solutions. One positive for sending someone to talk to the IEP students face-to-face is that the IEP students would become aware of events on campus. However, there is a question of who would be the designated person to go the IEP and talk to the students face-to-face. Will it be a one-time announcement? Could this solution last? The positive for “service learning” is that it could enhance interaction with different nationalities. Although “service learning” could be good for the program in general, this solution does not focus on the central problem of disconnect between the students and campus. The last solution explored was to form a committee on campus. This would allow for ongoing face-to-face interaction with the IEP students and the committee would be continually working to solve problem of disconnect among the students and campus.

Step 4: Consensus Decision Making

Team iPhone decided that forming a committee that focused on ways to better involve and connect the IEP students on campus would be the best solution to the central problem. The committee would not only discuss and research the problem more thoroughly, but they would approach different student organizations about the issue to make them more aware. The organization leaders could communicate with the rest of the organization and implement solutions such as; making posters for events in different languages, going to the IEP to invite the students to different events, etc.

Step 5: Implementing the Solution Chosen

On October 29th, Charity will talk to OBU's spiritual life committee about creating a committee to focus on enhancing IEP student involvement on campus. If team iPhone cannot get help from the spiritual life committee, Yue Liu will go and talk to Dean Skaggs about possibly forming the committee. The members of the committee will include all of the members of Team iPhone and whoever Dean Skaggs suggests. When the committee is established, Hannah Ashley and Jessica Rose will get a list of activities going on the campus and Charity, Quintin Magruder, and Yue Liu will go to the IEP classroom and invite the IEP students to get involved in these activities. The members of the committee will also set up meetings with the leaders of the organizations to discuss how they can implement the IEP students in their organization and organization activities. Finally, on November 25th, Team iPhone will conduct a survey with the international students in order to evaluate of how well the solution is working.

Charity Jernigan, Hannah Ashley, Quintin Magruder, Yue Liu, Jessica Rose

P-MOPS Analysis (Revised)

Step 1: Problem Description and Analysis

Potential problems in the Intensive English Program (IEP) at Oklahoma Baptist University (OBU) include the following; Keely Robertson (director of the IEP) recently quit, homesickness among international students, the IEP students have no interaction with other nationalities outside of class, cultural differences, etc. After discussing all of these problems, team iPhone concluded that the above problems were based on our own observations. We also concluded that the observation about the IEP students having no interaction with other nationalities outside of class was based on the perception of the Chinese students. We decided it was best to get the take on problems within the IEP program from the perception of the actually

IEP students as well as from the perception of students that were not Chinese. Therefore we set up another time to meet with IEP students that were not Chinese and we asked them questions that were similar to the questions we asked the Chinese students when we interviewed them.

We concluded in our interview with Chilean and Brazilian IEP students that the Chilean and Brazilian students spend time with few American students outside of class time, which is still more than the Chinese students. We also concluded that there was only one Chilean student, therefore he had to spend time with students that were a different nationality than him. However when we asked the students about problems within the IEP program and their time here they did not complain. Overall, they enjoyed their time here.

We asked the Chilean and Brazilian students if they knew about or went to events that were put on by student organizations on campus. They replied that they did not normally go to events, similar to the answer that the Chinese students gave to the same question. We also asked the IEP students if they put on campus wide events, and they replied that they did not put on campus wide events, but they did have events that were for the IEP students only.

Therefore, team iPhone concluded that the central problem for the IEP community was that there still seemed to be a disconnect between the IEP students and campus. We also concluded that there were many reasons for this disconnect, but the central reason being that American students generally believe that the international students like to isolate themselves. American students are not aware of international students. We also concluded that there were not many opportunities for the IEP students to intermingle with American students. Ultimately, how can team iPhone increase the awareness of international students at OBU?

Step 2: Generating and Elaborating on Possible Solutions

There were many possible solutions that team iPhone explored. One being that student organizations could be more vocal to the IEP specifically about the different activities/events on campus. Different ideas for this included; making posters in the students' language, and someone going to the IEP location and talking to the students face-to-face. Another solution could be that the IEP could adopt a type of "service learning" program for the IEP students. This would include putting the IEP students in groups with other nationalities to complete a service project to possibly enhance interaction with different nationalities outside of class. The final solution discussed was to establish a committee on campus that specifically focused on connecting the IEP to campus. The committee would go to different organization co-chairs and discuss how they could involve the students in their organization and advertise specifically to the IEP students.

Step 3: Evaluating Possible Solutions

Team iPhone discussed the positives and negatives of all of the possible solutions. One positive for sending someone to talk to the IEP students face-to-face is that the IEP students would become aware of events on campus. However, there is a question of who would be the designated person to go the IEP and talk to the students face-to-face. Will it be a one-time announcement? Could this solution last? The positive for "service learning" is that it could enhance interaction with different nationalities. Although "service learning" could be good for the program in general, this solution does not focus on the central problem of disconnect between the students and campus. The last solution explored was to form a committee on campus. This would allow for ongoing face-to-face interaction with the IEP students and the committee would be continually working to solve problem of disconnect among the students and campus.

Step 4: Consensus Decision Making

Team iPhone decided that forming a committee that focused on ways to better involve and connect the IEP students on campus would be the best solution to the central problem. The committee would not only discuss and research the problem more thoroughly, but they would approach different student organizations about the issue to make them more aware. The committee would try different possible ways of communicating with the IEP students to figure out what the best ways to communicate are (facebook, face-to-face, email, posters). The organization leaders (not the committee) could communicate with the rest of the organization and implement solutions (not limited to the following solutions, these are just examples) such as; making posters for events in different languages, going to the IEP to invite the students to different events, and encouraging the IEP to put on campus wide events as well.

Step 5: Implementing the Solution Chosen

On October 29th, Charity will talk to OBU's spiritual life committee about creating a committee to focus on enhancing IEP student involvement on campus. If team iPhone cannot get help from the spiritual life committee, Yue Liu will go and talk to Dean Skaggs about possibly forming the committee. The members of the committee will include all of the members of Team iPhone and whoever Dean Skaggs suggests. When the committee is established, Hannah Ashley and Jessica Rose will get a list of activities going on the campus and Charity, Quintin Magruder, and Yue Liu will go to the IEP classroom and invite the IEP students to get involved in these activities. The members of the committee will also set up meetings with the leaders of the organizations to discuss how they can implement the IEP students in their organization and organization activities. Finally, on November 25th, Team iPhone will conduct a survey with the international students in order to evaluate of how well the solution is working.