

Teamwork & Group Dynamics

Adrian Millward-Sadler & Annette Casey (FH Joanneum)

National University of La Plata

La Plata, Argentina

26th March, 2019



"The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."

FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSE ONLY



Groups & Teams

Activity

'Teams are *central* to organizational success' (Martin & Bal, 2006).

Discuss in a small group the following questions:

- What is the difference between a group and a team?
- What makes a good team?



Co-funded by the

of the European Union



Groups & Teams

Feedback

- 'Teams are *central* to organizational success' (Martin & Bal, 2006).
- Teams are groups, but not all groups are teams.
- A team is an interdependent group, 'who *share common goals*, and must *coordinate their activities* to accomplish these goals' (Koger-Hill, 2013, p. 287).
- 'For teams to be successful, the organizational culture needs to support member involvement' (Northouse, 2013).
- To be successful, *leadership must be shared* between team members – this is known as '*Distributed Leadership*' (Day, Gronn, & Salas, 2004).





Groups & Teams

Gr oup	Primary	 interact frequently working towards a common goal often small groups or project teams 	TE AM
TYP E	Secondary	 interact infrequently not necessarily working towards the same goal often large groups (e.g. committees) 	
	Formal	 intentionally created by organisation to serve a specific need 	
	Informal	 form outside of formal structures according to personal needs of participants (networks) 	



(Kakabadse, et al., 1988)



Life Cycle of a Team





Open Systems Model of Teamwork

INPUTS	THROUGHPUTS	Ουτρυτς
Controlled by management	Transforming tasks & activities	Outcomes
+ Climate + Group configuration	 + Processes + Cohesiveness + Communication + Decision making + Task activities + Maintenance activities 	+ Task performance + Individual outputs + Other outputs

(Schermerhorn, et al., 1995; Ingram, et al., 1997)





Paper Cup Tower

Build the tallest tower possible using only paper cups.

Rules:

- Teams of 3
- 2 designers / 1 worker
- 50 cups
- 15 minute design time
- 15 minute build time



Image (retrieved 25.05.2014): <u>http://adsme.co/wp-</u> <u>content/uploads/2015/04/cup-tower-amazing-ideas-5-on-</u> <u>uncategorized-design-ideas.jpg</u>



Paper Cup Tower

Build the tallest tower possible using only paper cups.

Design phase:

- Workers leave the room.
- 15 minutes design time.
- Sketch / draw design.
- Designers do <u>NOT</u> touch cups!



Image (retrieved 25.05.2014): <u>http://adsme.co/wp-</u> <u>content/uploads/2015/04/cup-tower-amazing-ideas-5-on-</u> <u>uncategorized-design-ideas.jpg</u>



Paper Cup Tower

Build the tallest tower possible using only paper cups.

Build phase:

- Worker does <u>NOT</u> see plans.
- 15 minutes build time.
- Worker directed by designers.
- Designers do <u>NOT</u> touch cups!



Image (retrieved 25.05.2014): <u>http://adsme.co/wp-</u> <u>content/uploads/2015/04/cup-tower-amazing-ideas-5-on-</u> <u>uncategorized-design-ideas.jpg</u>



Paper Cup Tower

Build the tallest tower possible using only paper cups.

Build phase (part 2):

- Worker blindfolded.
- Worker may only use weaker hand (left / right).
- Designers do <u>NOT</u> touch cups!





Feedback: inputs, throughputs & outputs

INPUTS	Throughputs	OUTPUTS
+ Were the team members	+ During the task, who made	+ Did the team complete the
well suited to their roles?	decisions? Was the decision-making	assigned task?
+ Were the abilities of team	process pre-established?	+ Should this team work
members taken into	+ Was there a team leader? If so,	together again in the future
account?	how was this person chosen?	on other tasks?
	 + What maintenance behaviours were required to complete the task? + Who performed these maintenance behaviours? 	





Team Roles

Role	+	_
Implementer	Turns ideas into actions	Inflexible when plan in motion
COORDINATOR	Promotes decision making	Manipulative and delegates
Shaper	Overcomes obstacles	Too aggressive
PLANT	(Unorthodox) problem solver	Poor communicator
RESOURCE INVESTIGATOR	Enthusiastically explores opportunities	Loses interest
MONITOR EVALUATOR	Analytical and seeks all options	Works slowly, often cynical
TEAM-WORKER	Builds relationships, reduces tension	Avoids decisive, divisive action
COMPLETER FINISHER	Finds errors, brings project to end	Refuse to delegate ? slow
Specialist	Provides expert knowledge & skills	Little interest outside own field



(Belbin, 1981) Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme







Leadership Decision Questions

- 1. Should I continue *monitoring* or take *action*?
- 1. Should I intervene to take care of *relational* or *task* needs?
- 1. Should I intervene *internally* or *externally*?



Image (retrieved 10.11.18): https://www.dreamstime.com/stockphotos-deciding-which-door-tochoose-image7770103#res170862





Example











Example











Five Team Dysfunctions

Absence of Trust

- Lack of confidence in team-mates
- Personal weaknesses are protected and hidden
- Personal Histories







Five Team Dysfunctions

Fear of Conflict

- Conflict and debate avoided in meetings & discussions
- Protection of personal feelings due to feelings of vulnerability
- Mining

Thomas–Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument





Five Team Dysfunctions

Lack of Committment

- Team-members have not bought into the process
- Lack of consensus and clarity regarding project goals
- Deadlines
- Worst Case Analysis





Five Team Dysfunctions

Avoidance of Accountability

- Unwillingness to take responsibility
- Unwillingness to call out others when perfomance drops
- Publication of standards
- Review of performance





Five Team Dysfunctions

Innattention to Results

- Focus on personal and not team goals
- Focus on personal status as a team-member
- Public declaration of resultsResults-based rewards



A



Universal Characteristics of Team Excellence

- Clear goals
- Results-driven structure
- Competent team members
- Unified committment
- Collaborative climate
- Standards of excellence
- External support & recognition
- Principled leadership



(Larson & LaFasto, 1989, p.299)





Team Performance

What can a distributed leader do to :

- increase subordinate responsibility?
- influence decision making?
- promote interest beyond the self?
- create a positive working environment?







Example: case study (blended learning)

Work with your *team*.

- Go to the case study: <u>https://unlpteamwork.wordpress.com/</u>
- Read the case study and discuss the *guiding questions* (next slide).
- Consider how you would respond in a discussion assignment.
- Use the ideas in the script to help you.





Example: case study (blended learning)

Guiding Questions

- Are any of the characteristics of team excellence missing (Larson & LaFasto, 1989) in this team?
- 1. Using the model of team leadership (Koger-Hill, 2013) should Sam monitor or intervene? If he intervenes, what action should he take?
- 1. Can this team's problems be attributed to any of the five dysfunctions of a team (Lencioni, 2002) and if so, what remedies could be used?
- 1. According to Tuckman's (1965) theory of team development, what stage does this team appear to be at?





References

- Bales, R. F. (1965) 'The equilibrium problem in small groups' in A. P. Hare, E. F. Borgatta and R. F. Bales (eds.) Small Groups: Studies in social interaction, New York: Knopf.
- Belbin, R., 1981. *Management Teams: Why They Succeed or Fail*. London: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2004). Leadership capacity in teams. *Leadership Quarterly, 15*(6), 857-880.
- Graen, G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship Based Approach to Leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership Over 25 Years: Applying a Multi-level, Multi-domain Perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Ingram, H., Teare, R., Scheuing, E. & Armistead, C., 1997. A systems model of effective teamwork. *The TQM Magazine*, 9(2), pp. 118-127.
- Kakabadse, A., Ludlow, R. & Vinnicombe, S., 1988. *Working In Organisations*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Koger-Hill, S. (2013). Team Leadership. In P. Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (pp. 287-318). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Larson, C., & LaFasto, F. (1989). Teamwork: What must go right/what can go wrong. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Lencioni, P. (2002). *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Martin, A., & Bal, V. (2015). *The State of Teams.* Colorado Springs, CO: Center for Creative Leadership. Retrieved 11 11, 2018, from https://www.ccl.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/StateOfTeams.pdf
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: theory and practice* (6th ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Rowe, G. W., & Guerrero, L. (2011). Cases in Leadership. London: SAGE.
- Schermerhorn, J., Hunt, J. & Osborn, R., 1995. *Basic Organisational Behaviour.* New York: Wiley.
- Tuckman, B. (1965). Developmental Sequence in Small Groups. (A. P. Association, Ed.) *Psychological Bulletin, 63*(6), 384-399.





Teamwork & Group Dynamics

Adrian Millward-Sadler & Annette Casey (FH Joanneum)

National University of La Plata

La Plata, Argentina

26th March, 2019

"The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union



FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSE ONLY