Tuckman And Tom Edison Model Of Team Developments Applied By Stkip Weetebula Team For Implementation Of SPS (Seminar-Practice-School)

Wilhelmus Yape Kii¹

¹Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Weetebula

Abstract: The first part of this paper explains the team development of Tuckman’s and Edison’s models including the differences between these two models. The paper starts with Tuckman’s model, which is known as a traditional model of team development. In 1965, Tuckman stated that an organization that would like to accomplish its goal through teamwork followed four main stages of team development, which he named as forming, storming, norming and performing. In 1977, Tuckman and Mary Ann Jansen added a fifth stage named adjourning. In 2011, Edison assessed that Tuckman’s model could be further developed. Tuckman's traditional model is needed for understanding a team's basic functional stages, but his model needs to be expanded for greater understanding of team development, especially during a team's dysfunctional phases. This article identifies one phase of team development that complements the classic five phases developed by Tuckman. To reach the objectives of a project team, it is important to understand and review the dysfunctional phases (conforming and deforming) that a team encounters so that appropriate corrective actions can be taken to aid a team in becoming high-performing. Based on the analysis of those two models, this article explains the integration of these models when applied by STKIP Weetebula team when working on improving the learning process. The main goal of the team is developing and implementing a new subject on the curriculum of all study programs of STKIP Weetebula, Sumba, Indonesia. The new subject is named as SPS (Seminar-Praktek-Sekolah/Seminar-Practice-Schools). The team has started to work from August 2016 to August 2017. The team has designed an action planning for SPS and has implemented it in March 2017. The team consists of 2 pedagogical advisors/facilitator from Germany, 6 STKIP lecturers, and 1 staff member. This article shows how SPS team works to reach its goals by integration of team development stages of Tuckman’s and Edison’s models.
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Team Development.

Generally, a team is a number of people who are working together for specific goals. Dyer (2007) stated the difference between a staff and a team. He defines that a staff usually work with a boss and most of the staff’s duties relate to the boss while in a team, a boss and team members working together to reach the goals. A team is important to almost every organization including an education organization. Teamwork will help an organization to be more successful in reaching its goals because teamwork is better than individual work particularly if the job or duty required several different skills (Dyer, 2007). In a team, there will be an interaction, a cooperation...
and a collaboration between team members to support each other in reaching team’s goals (Sallis, 2015). It is a clear understanding that the concept of teamwork is needed for team members to enhance awareness about cooperation. This will help a team to prioritize the team goals and not the individual goals of every team member. Cooperation and collaboration will improve the ability of the team to overcome problems and to improve the decision-making quality (Soleha, 2010).

Each stage of team development has its own special challenges, particularly how team members striving to work together successfully. It is important to the team and the organization to take into consideration some actions at each stage of team development to support the team’s success in pursuing goals (Abudi, 2010).

In addition, the leader with good leadership skills and experiences is important to the changing and developing the team. The leader supports the team at each stage of development because this understanding is critical to the team’s success (Abudi, 2010).

### Stages of team development based on Bruce Tuckman model

A good team needs to be developed for an effective performance. Ideally, a good team goes through several stages as Burce Wayne Tuckman introduced into his model. Tuckman is the first person introduced the four main stages of team development based on his study about the clustering pages about physiotherapy in the USA. The process of clustering these papers led Tuckman to introduce his model in 1965 named as “Tuckman stages”.

At the beginning, the concept of team development consisted of four parts, named as orientation/testing/dependence, to (2) conflict, to (3) group cohesion, to (4) functional role-relatedness that later he used term stages: forming, storming, norming and performing. He stated that for a team to grow together to the point where they are functioning effectively and delivering high-quality results, every team need to follow those stages (Tuckman, 1965).

A fifth stage” adjourning stage” was added by Tuckman and Mary Ann Jensen in 1977. The adjourning stage is added when the team completed the current project. The main reason when adding this last stage was team members might join other teams and move on to other work (Abudi, 2010).

The figure below describes the five main stages of Tuckman’s team development:

![Figure 1. The five main stages of Tuckman’s team development](image)

#### Stage 1. Forming

An organization may consider several aspects when building a team such as resources availability, a number of team members, composition (skills and experiences) of team members, goals of the team, and a period to finish the teamwork (Tuckman 1965). Tuckman introduced the first stage “forming” as orientation, testing, and dependence. At this stage, the team leader plays an important role to introduce the project goals or objectives. Leader initiates the orientation period of the project, including invites all team members for the first meeting.

A leader provides an opportunity for all members to introduce each other particularly for a team that consists of new members. All members introduced each other, sharing their background, experiences, and interests so all team members might know each other. Each team member is given a chance to build a relationship with other members, as every team member will rely each other on performing their duties. They are given a chance to know each other so they might know how to deal, or how they will depend on each other when performing their jobs. This part of this stage is important particularly if there are some new members of the team (Tuckman, 1965).

On the other hand, if team members have known each other or worked together on several previous projects, the team could invite the leader of the
organization to initiate discussion about the background of the project. The leader of the organization is given an opportunity to tell all team members about the goals of the team and if necessary, to share ideas and thought about responsibilities that the team will take. The organization leader could provide a clear information about resources and time duration available to support the successful of the project. It is also important to all team members to know at the beginning of the project about those information’s and to reflect it whether they could reach the goal or not. In this stage, the team has not yet started their project, they have not yet worked.

Stage 2. Storming

The next stage of forming stage is named as “conflict” or known as storming stage (Tuckman, 1965). The non-experience team members usually have some difficulties when going through this stage. The new member competes for status or for arguing with their ideas. If the situation could not be controlled by the team leader, it may influence the experience team members to become irritated when discussing and explaining ideas, especially when discussing ideas with the non-experience. They may exhaust if the new member tries to dominate or even perform a bad behaviour when arguing ideas (Abudi, 2010).

Team members may face difficulties if there are different opinions between team members on job descriptions, or when sharing responsibility about their duties. A team consists of members from different nationalities, cultures, and languages will spend more time together. Team member begins to develop a way of communicating, sharing ideas, and working together to reach team goals. Team member respects each other and starts to understand the value of their differences. They communicate each other if they have information that’s important to teamwork. They also begin to trust each other and showing respective attitude. Team members realize that they must improve their work performances, they begin to share ideas, respect and value the difference of their ideas and opinions. They attend meetings and discussions and contribute in the meeting to speed up their work performances. It seems that in this stage they work as a “family team” that keen to reach their goals. Most of the team work with high motivation. In addition, the team has agreed upon procedures for diagnosing, analysing, and resolving teamwork problems and conflicts (Abudi, 2010).

In this stage, the role of team leader becomes more participative leadership. Team leader role in decision-making and problem-solving is reducing in comparison to the previous stage. The leader delegates some parts of his duties to team members since they have worked together effectively and showed better performance.

Stage 3. Norming

In this stage, the team starts to work more effectively in comparison with the previous stage and it begins to understanding the goals. A team consists of members from different nationalities, cultures, and languages will spend more time together. Team member begins to develop a way of communicating, sharing ideas, and working together to reach team goals. Team member respects each other and starts to understand the value of their differences. They communicate each other if they have information that’s important to teamwork. They also begin to trust each other and showing respective attitude. Team members realize that they must improve their work performances, they begin to share ideas, respect and value the difference of their ideas and opinions. They attend meetings and discussions and contribute in the meeting to speed up their work performances. It seems that in this stage they work as a “family team” that keen to reach their goals. Most of the team work with high motivation. In addition, the team has agreed upon procedures for diagnosing, analysing, and resolving teamwork problems and conflicts (Abudi, 2010).

In this stage, the role of team leader becomes more participative leadership. Team leader role in decision-making and problem-solving is reducing in comparison to the previous stage. The leader delegates some parts of his duties to team members since they have worked together effectively and showed better performance.

Stage 4. Performing

A team that reaches this stage can be said to a successful team because, in this stage, the team best performance occurred. At this stage, the real work of the team is progressing and a team function effectively almost in every level to pursue its goals (Tuckman, 1965). In a “performing” team, almost
every member highly motivated and working become interdependent. They solve problems and make decisions effectively. They communicate openly, honestly and respectfully. Team members could express their opinions, ideas for problem solution, clarifications freely and others will be listening actively and trying to understand. Team members trust each other and have a good relationship. Team members create an environment where they are comfortable on taking a reasonable risk and could produce high-quality decision together on reaching the goals (Abudi, 2010).

In this stage, the role of team leader on decision-making and problem-solving reduces in comparison to the earlier stage. The leader delegates the decision-making and problem-solving to the member excerpts if the decision influences higher level in the organization, the leader may act as a gateway. The leader may have requested some weekly reports to monitor the working progress of the team. However, on some occasion such as member leaves the team or new member introduces in the team, or the team does not function may cause team could not reach this stage and revert to the previous stage even to the early stage until they manage it back and be functioning.

Stage 5: Adjourning

In this stage, the team already finished its work and the team member may move into different directions (Abudi, 2010). In this stage, the team celebrates their success and would like to be separate for other duties. The team leader provides an appreciation for members of their success on reaching objectives. In some occasion, this stage can be used to conduct evaluation about problems that could not be resolved. This practice will help all team members to gain lesson for a better improvement on their future works.

Tom Edison model of Team Development

In 2008, Tom Edison further developed the traditional model of team development of Bruce Tuckman's. His working is not based on empirical data and suggested others to further investigate with empirical data. Tuckman described the basic functional stage, which Edison (2011) recommends that Tuckman’s model “needs to be expanded for greater understanding of team development, especially during a team’s dysfunctional phases”. Tom Edison (2011) said that “he introduces information what is going beyond Tuckman's traditional phases and will, hopefully, help in understanding a team's "complete" developmental life cycle”. Edison argues that on Tuckman’s stage, there is a situation when the team facing dysfunctional phase, particularly on stage storming and norming. It is important to understand the situation on each stage of Tuckman’s particularly during the dysfunctional phase so the team could take appropriate steps to bring the team performance on functional phase for higher performing team. The action of changing the dysfunctional phase to be a functional phase needs transformational action. Edison provided detail phases that a team could take if they need to transform the dysfunctional to a functional situational.

Edison proposes four phases i.e. “informing, conforming, transforming, and deforming” that could be implemented when team facing dysfunctional phase on Tuckman’s stage. Team members, particularly the team leader must aware the situation where the team is facing the dysfunctional situation because it is difficult to predict when the situation may occur (Sallis, 2015). They need to focus on transforming the difficult situation to be a functional phase to create a high-performance team (Davies, 2014).

Informing

Most of the team may struggle when facing the storming and norming stage of Tuckman’s traditional model. Some teams could not go through these stages due to lack of ability to tackle problems that arise from these stages (Edison, 2011). He states that “the stage of informing at the top of the life cycle curve (or the tipping point of team development) highlights that one of the positive roles of the high-performing team is to inform others about positive team results and conclusions”. A team is at its informing stage should be sharing their experiences, both successes, and failures. It is necessary that a team developed better communication between members to share important information including ideas and experiences.

The team leader must inform team members any good performances to motivate the team on producing higher performance (Fritz et all, 2005). The team leader needs to show a good ability to detect problems that could dysfunction the team
performance. In addition, the leader may bring in an outside facilitator. If the team being informed of any potential problems they may develop a solution to it, but if they are not informed, they could move to the next phase of Edison’s model which is conforming or deforming (Edison, 2011).

**Conforming**

“Conforming is a phase in which the thinking or decision-making of the team is lacking original, creative, and/or innovative ideas” (Edison 2011). Conforming is a situation when a team member showing low in creativity, or losing original ideas, or lacking innovative thinking. This might happen when a team tends to produce “groupthink, a phase that reduces the creativity and innovation of the team because the individual members have become uninspired to think independently or to consider ideas or solutions that run counter to those supported by the majority of the team. While there is a sense of cohesiveness that can be reassuring to the individual team members (especially if they are looking for uniformity and stability of thinking), the creative juices” (Edison 2011). He identifies that when team showing a tendency that members become conforming, it shows that the team may become dysfunctional. The team leader plays an important role when the team reaches this phase. If he fails to tackle this situation, it may lead to the next phase which is deforming.

**Deforming**

“Once the team has become entrenched in the conforming stage, it has become dysfunctional. It will start to disband or deform. Deforming manifests itself in members starting to miss team meetings, not contributing to the required activation energy needed to sustain the team's effective performance, and not focusing on vital team goals or objectives. A deforming team begins to lose its members, and those who stay is no longer effective. No new ideas are being created, and the team has outlived its useful life” (Edison, 2011). The team leader is urgently needed in this situation because members become deforms. It is important to create a quick decision as possible to bounded the problems and seeking for any solutions to bring the team to be functional. The team members unable to look for any solutions, they tend to give up and thinking others possibilities which may not be related to the goals of the team.

**Transforming**

A team leader needs to act after detecting that team has become dysfunctional. The team leader begins to analyse and may consider bringing new energy or action that transforming team to be a functional team. “Team have to identify not only the positive functional phases but also to identify the negative or dysfunctional phases early in the life cycle so they can be detected, studied, and corrected and reversed before they become too serious” (Edison, 2011). The team leader may solve the problem by adding a new member or asking advice from an external facilitator, or even if it is necessary pulling out a member that has an influence on reducing the innovative, or creativity of others team members. Transformation of a team is necessary for the team to accomplish its overall goals (Davies 2014). The transformation enables a team to get back or recover as soon as possible on functional phase and following the traditional Tuckman’s stages of norming and performing. Team members need to be informed that they are on functional phase and prepare for high performing (Edison, 2011).
teachers particularly in remote islands like Sumba Island that located at eastern part of Indonesia, (both in quality and quantity). Sumba Island in East Nusa Tenggara province is one of many remote Islands in Indonesia where education is fairly rudimentary. The number of students is very high and the distribution of the teachers is highly uneven. The shortage of teachers in primary and secondary schools was caused by the lack of attention to teacher training and to the development of education programs. Sumba needs more well-trained and motivated teachers.

In 2009, an Education Foundation, Yayasan Pendidikan Nusa Cendana (YAPNUSDA), the bishop of Weetebula Diocesan, and the local government initiated to establish a teacher training college - STKIP Weetebula - to meet the needs of Sumba to have a sufficient number of qualified teachers. STKIP offered four (4) programs of study: Primary Teacher Education, Mathematic Education, Physic Education, and Indonesian Language and Literature Education. In February 2017, STKIP Weetebula has graduated 750 students and almost 73% of the alumni have started teaching around Southwest Sumba and West Sumba District. Most of them were recruited by the schools where they had their teaching practice before. STKIP cannot entirely and solely solve the challenges in Education Development in Sumba but STKIP has been gradually contributing to provide qualified teachers for schools in Sumba.

YAPNUSDA and STKIP Weetebula acknowledged in its education policy that the teachers are the main instrument for bringing improvements in learning and the adequate teacher management structures, policies and strategies are key factors that determine the teachers’ performance. Through several meetings with alumni, the local government and the community, they expect STKIP to contribute towards the economic development and poverty reduction by making education more relevant to social and economic progress. This will be achieved by the establishment of a curriculum that promotes development skills including life skills and social cohesion.

Since 2012, Misereor/KZE Germany has supported STKIP Weetebula on the capacity building program. In 2016, a new project was started and funded by Misereor/KZE with the main goal is to establish a new curriculum for all study programs that fulfilling the national standard and most importantly is to contribute the education development in this region. To meet this goal, STKIP designs a new subject that aims to improve the teaching skills of the teacher candidate by involving several consultants. Consultants and STKIP management began to find inputs and information from stakeholders since early 2016, then decided to carry out the SPS.

b. The new subject (SPS)

STKIP Weetebula’s pedagogical advisor/facilitator, Mr. Jurgen Dornis, Ms. Mathilde Franke (from Germany), STKIP management (Rector, Vice Rector), and Misereor Germany have discussed the concept of SPS since mid-2015. Then, Mr. Dornis with Ms. Franke conducted several workshops and invited STKIP alumni, teachers, lecturers, and other STKIP Weetebula stakeholders to gain inputs and develop the SPS concept.

Annual meeting, 4 August 2016. The concept of SPS was introduced to all lecturers and staffs on the annual meeting that held on 4 August 2016. About 55 people attended the meeting that leads by Rector of STKIP. The aim of this meeting was to evaluate our previous programs and discussed some future programs. It was the first time that Rector, Mr. Dornis, Ms. Franke informed all lecturers from 4 study programs at STKIP Weetebula to prepare the SPS on this academic year. The main goal of this new subject is to improve the teaching skills and to give an additional real class teaching experiences for teacher candidates before they undergo the PPL (Program Pengalaman Lapangan/Real Class Teaching Practice).

Previously, STKIP students teaching skills were developed only through Microteaching and PPL. Based on workshops and inputs from stakeholders, we agreed that students need more opportunity to improve their teaching skills through SPS. In my opinion, STKIP Weetebula is the only institution that conducting SPS in Indonesia at this moment. The main concept of SPS is students (under the guidance and supervision of lecturers) will design a lesson plan at the campus on the first week. On the second week, students and their supervisor will teach at STKIP’s partner schools, 1 or 2 students will teach while others will observe in the real class. Then, all students will come back to the campus for an evaluation and to prepare the next lesson plan for another student.

We agreed to develop a team that carries out the SPS program next semester (March-July 2017). We also decided that the SPS team will conduct the
first meeting on 20 August 2016.

c. Stages of SPS Team Development

Forming (recruitment of team members, brainstorming ideas, sharing ideas).

Based on the recommendation of the annual meeting (4 August 2016), STKIP leaders formed the SPS team consisted of 9 members and the structure of the team is shown in figure 3:

1. Mr. Juergen Dornis, Pedagogical Advisor of STKIP Weetebula, AGEH’s worker from Germany with 40 years’ experiences in teaching. Acting as a consultant/facilitator in this project.
3. Mr. Agustinus T Daga, M.Pd. (Team leader), Vice Rector for Academic of STKIP Weetebula, an expert in curriculum development, 10 years’ experiences as a teacher and lecturer.
4. Mr. Kristo Dowa Bili S.Pd, M.Pd., Head of Elementary School Teacher Study Program, 4 years’ experiences as a lecturer.
5. Mr. Silvester Nusa, MA, Head of Bahasa Study Programs, 4 years’ experiences as a lecturer.
6. Mr. Elyakim Supriyedi, M.Pd, Head of Physics Study Programs, 5 years’ experiences as a lecturer.
7. Mr. Ferdinandus Sole, M.Pd, Head of Mathematics Study Programs, 4 years’ experiences as a lecturer.
8. Ms. Pupu Purwaningsih, Manager of Misereor Project, 4 years’ experiences as a lecturer.
9. Ms. Martina, S.Pd, assistant to Mr Dornis, 1-year experience as administrative staff.

The SPS team had the first meeting on Saturday, 20 August 2016. The meeting started with the opening statement of STKIP’s Rector. He explained that the goal of the SPS team is to prepare a new subject in March 2017. He mentioned that the team will work together for more than 6 months. The rector also mentioned that although team members have known each other, but most of the team members had no experiences working with people from overseas particularly with Mr. Dornis and Ms. Franke. The main challenge will be a communication (language barrier) including social and cultural approaches.

In the second part of the meeting, Mr. Dornis and Ms. Franke presented their study about the lesson plan that used by STKIP since 2013. They said that it might be difficult for the students to understand and use it as guidance for teaching in a real classroom. Then, they invited other members to give inputs about this issue. Mr. Silvester mentioned that most of his students facing difficulties when they explore the materials, most of them only memorizing-learning by heart (first step of Bloom Theory) and sometimes they do not understand the meaning of what they studied. In addition, he also mentioned that most of his students only try to duplicate what other students do. Mr Ferdinandus added that most of his students do not understand the stages of the lesson plan (exploration, elaboration, and confirmation), they started their lesson plan with apperception without a link to the next step of their lesson plan. Mr Kristoforus also agreed that most of his students do not understand the goal of their lesson planning. At the middle of this meeting, the pedagogical advisors offered a simple version of the lesson plan. Members agreed with the simple lesson plan offered because it is easier to understand and applicable to their students. They also agree to have a second meeting in September 2016.

Storming (second meeting, additional meeting by core team, decision of leader)

The second meeting (10 September 2016) was conducted on the main campus. The invitation was sent 3 days before the meeting day. In the beginning of the meeting, pedagogical advisers provided information about the action planning for SPS (informing-Edison’s model). There were many discussions, debates and different argumentation between team members during this meeting.

Figure 3. Structure of SPS team
meeting. The reason for this vigorous debate and argumentation is due to most of the team members have not yet fully understood the concept of SPS, especially about the action plan, modules, materials, and procedures of SPS. They have not yet experienced in implementing a new subject on STKIP curriculum. There were some indications that they refused this new idea by saying that our students unable to apply this method, some said that it will be difficult to cooperate with most of these partner schools because the SPS will influence the learning schedule of the partner schools. They also assumed that schools will not cooperate in this program because schools are busy with the final national examination during April-July (conforming- Edison’s Model). At the end of the meeting, team members disagreed to carry out the SPS, which means that the team becomes dysfunctional. However, all team members agreed to meet again on Saturday, 17 September 2017.

The team leader and facilitator detected that the different opinion between team members probably due to a misunderstanding of the concept of SPS and some difficulties how they will teach this new subject. At the third meeting, not all team members attended the meeting (deforming - Edison’s Model). The communication between pedagogical advisors and team members from Indonesia became a bit difficult due to a language barrier. This situation became a critical situation for the team. It is urgent for a team leader to take a quick decision as soon as possible to overcome the problems. The leader analysed the situation and conducted an internal discussion with pedagogical advisors to find out which steps needed to motivate team members and transform the dysfunctional situation of the team. The team leader reported the situation to the Rector of STKIP Weetebula about the result of the last meeting and his internal meeting with the facilitator. The rector decided to carry out the SPS at STKIP Weetebula. To overcome some disagreements between team members, the leader and facilitator must promptly prepare a complete and clear action plan, materials, modules, procedures of SPS for team members. In addition, the team must invite school’s partners to discuss the action planning, materials, modules, procedures of SPS whether it is applicable for their schools. To lower the miscommunication between team members, rector suggested inviting English interpreter for a better communication between consultant/facilitator and other team members (transforming - Edison’s model).

In November 2016, the final draft of the action planning, modules, materials, procedures of SPS was handed to all members to be studied for the meeting in December 2016 (performing-Edison’s model).

**Norming**

On the 20th of December 2016, the team had a meeting to discuss the final draft of the action plan, modules, materials, procedures of SPS. Most of the team members attended the meeting. It seems that by handing the final draft of the action planning, modules, materials, and procedures of SPS before the meeting, has stimulated team members to read and study the draft for a better understanding. At this meeting, the team started to communicate and understanding each other. They clarified some parts of the action plan, modules, materials, and procedures of SPS for a better understanding. The interpreter was very helpful in building a better communication between team members and facilitator, particularly when team member required some clarifications from facilitator about the action plan, modules, materials, and procedures of SPS. At the second part of the meeting, the team agreed to design action plan particularly for the next important workshop between all lecturer/supervisor, school headmasters, and teachers. The team planned to have 3 days’ workshop in the mid of February 2017 about this subject (norming stage).

There are several criteria’s for SPS that decoded on this meeting:

1. SPS is obligatory for every student.
2. Every study programs offers SPS
3. Minimum 25 students taking part of SPS
4. SPS run for 1 semester at semester 6 and consists of 4 SKS /duration (200 minutes/per week).
5. All students with their lecturer must present at school and in STKIP Weetebula
6. Every student is planning to give at least one lesson at school
7. Every lesson is evaluated by the whole group.
8. SPS is in charge of 1 topic which is divided into lesson.
9. Schedule for SPS is shown in table below.
Performing (workshop with lecturer and teacher from primary and secondary school. SPS begin at STKIP Weetebula)

Most of these team members attended the fourth meeting on 26 January 2017. Team members decided to apply the SPS on 6 March 2017. In this meeting, they agreed to adjust the content of lesson plan with the material/subject of the schools. Lecturers and expert teachers from school partner will supervise students when designing their lesson plan. All team members decided to invite 11 elementary schools and 9 secondary schools on the next workshop. Each supervisor (lecturer) was responsible for inviting their school’s partner and to supervise about 10-15 students. 
All team members, supervisors, 20 headmasters, and 19 teachers from elementary and secondary school partner attended the first workshop on 16 - 17 February 2017. They successfully discussed the action plan of SPS, time schedule, and design the lesson plan for each lesson.

STKIP Weetebula has started the SPS program from 6 March 2017 to 30 July 2017. Team members are highly motivated on supervising their students and willing to make this programs run successfully.

Adjourning

The team finished their job on preparing the implementation of SPS. All team members and supervisor including teachers from school partners will be having the first evaluation in April 2017 and the second evaluation on August 2017.

Conclusion

The Edison’s model can be integrated into the second stage of Tuckman’s model (storming). Both models complement each other to create a better performance of team development. The Edison’s model provides detail information on the storming stage of Tuckman’s model, especially when the team being transformed from dysfunctional to become functional.

The integration of Tuckman’s and Edison’s model appropriates to a small team member (about 10 people), and for a temporary project time (about three weeks to several months).

In addition, the SPS team consists of members from different nationalities, cultures, and languages. This provides its own problems as communication and cultural norms being potential barriers to successful teamworking. However, introducing an interpreter may reduce these potential barriers. Team members spend more time together, in such case: it develops a basic level of trust which often creates a solid foundation for more detailed discussion later where more patience is displayed by team members.

The SPS team of STKIP Weetebula reaches its first goal to set up an action planning for implementing the SPS in March 2017. The second goal is applying the new subject SPS by all study program on 6 March 2016. The SPS team will conduct the first evaluation on April 2017 and the second evaluation in August 2017.

STKIP Weetebula will apply the SPS from January to July every year. We may know the impact of SPS on teaching skills of the teacher candidate of STKIP Weetebula after four to five years of implementation.
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