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Introduction
• CHM 203 workshop involves students working together in small groups to solve sets of problems under the guidance of a teaching assistant (TA).
• The students that get the most out of workshop are those who work in productive, interactive groups.
• Glenn Parker, in Team Players and Teamwork, proposes that an ideal group has one of each type of team player: the contributor, the collaborator, the communicator and the challenger.
• Each of these roles has its own unique strengths and weaknesses, and requires members of the other three roles to work at maximal efficiency.
• Due to the problem-solving nature of workshop, many students would gravitate towards the contributor and collaborator roles.
• The result of most favoring these two roles is a lack of communicators and challengers, who are just as necessary for groups to work at their best.

Hypothesis
Workshops in CHM 203 are abundant in students displaying the contributor and collaborator player roles. These students want improvements related to the communicator and challenger roles.

Methods
• Students in 4 different workshops were given a survey to fill out.
• This survey consisted of two parts:
  • The first part determined their Parker role type by evaluating some basic personality traits and how they worked within their group.
  • The second part consisted of a single question that allowed students to recommend how their workshop should be improved.
• Each question’s responses were ranked 1-4, with 4 being the answer the student most agreed with, and 1 being the answer they least agreed with.

Results
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**Total Points Each Role Earned**
- Contributor: 478
- Collaborator: 341
- Communicator: 215
- Challenger: 328
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**Total Number of Students per Role**
- Contributor: 17
- Collaborator: 3
- Communicator: 3
- Challenger: 2
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**Suggested Improvements by Parker Type**
- Contributor: 68
- Collaborator: 68
- Communicator: 68
- Challenger: 69

*Another graph, not shown here, revealed much the same data as the graph above. It indicated that the number of students who ranked an improvement a 4. This showed that, like the graph above, the collaborator and challenger improvements were the most desired among workshop students by a large margin (8 and 10, respectively, out of 24 students total.)*

Discussion
• The vast majority of students were found to be contributors, as expected.
• Surprisingly, the collaborator role was the role that students associated themselves least with.
• The communicator and challenger roles were slightly above the collaborator, but far below that of the contributor.
• When asked what they wanted to see improved in workshop, students ranked the collaborator- and challenger-associated improvements the highest.

Conclusion
• Although the collaborator role was in reality the least common role seen among workshop students surveyed, the prediction that students would want improvements that increase the importance of roles outside of their own was shown to be largely correct.
• The lack of suggestions for communication-related improvement despite there being few communicators could stem from multiple sources:
  • Perhaps the survey was biased against the communicator role and its suggested improvement.
  • While few said they communicators, many of those students may think of others as playing that role.
• This research can be used to allow for more efficient workshop groupings. Students could take a (more extensive) survey at their first workshop to determine what Parker role they fall under, and then TAs could get students of differing roles to work together.
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