

Research Studies On Creating Effective Teamwork

1.

The first qualitative paper, that I chose, on creating effective teamwork within organizations is "*Team leadership.*" written by Zaccaro, Rittman, & Marks (2001).

Description of the paper

The writers of this article use the prism of "functional leadership" to look at leader–team relationships. This concept basically states that the leader's primary responsibility is to do, or get done, whatever functions are not being handled sufficiently in terms of group needs. They describe this functional leadership approach in terms of their superordinate and thirteen subordinate leadership dimensions, as well as how these dimensions connect to team effectiveness and a variety of team processes. They also come up with a few guiding propositions. The reciprocal effect, in which both leadership and team processes influence one other, is an important consideration in such collaborations.

A well-developed, professional and scholarly article

They have outlined a number of essential components of team effectiveness in this article. Cognitive, motivational, emotional, and coordinating processes are used to categorize these activities. Despite the abundance of literature on leadership and team dynamics, few conceptual frameworks exist for how leaders contribute systematically to team performance. As a result, they have presented a few of these contributions as part of a larger team effectiveness model. They have also proposed that as teams gain more experience and expertise, other team members take on additional leadership roles, while designated leaders keep their boundary-spanning responsibilities. Finally, they have described a few ways in which teams might affect a leader's efficacy.

Current and reflective of the most recent knowledge in the area of teamwork

Most leadership theories that discuss team processes, according to the authors, see qualities as moderators that indicate which leadership behaviors are most suitable or effective in specific situations. (e.g., Fiedler, 1964; Kerr & Jermier, 1978; Kerr, Schriesheim, Murphy, & Stogdill, 1974). Researchers have not found among existing leadership theories one that deals to their satisfaction with the leadership of task-performing groups in organizations (Hackman and Walton, 1986). The authors support Kozlowski, Gully, Salas, and Cannon-Bowers (1996), in their claim that "Although there are substantial literatures in both [the team development and leadership] areas (e.g., Levine & Moreland, 1990; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992), existing models are limited in their ability to provide prescriptions to guide team leadership and to enhance team development" (p. 255). Few team performance models, on the other hand, define leadership

processes as essential drivers of team processes (e.g., Hirokawa, 1980; McGrath, 1991). As a result, in outlining future study needs on team performance, McIntyre and Salas (1995) identified some crucial issues about the behaviors that constitute effective team leadership, as well as the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other traits that enable such behaviors. These findings highlight the need for conceptual models of collective performance that take into account both leadership and team dynamics.

Organizational and global teamwork

According to the authors, team effectiveness depends fundamentally upon how well team members can coordinate their actions, in both organizational and global teamwork. In both cases, leaders raise team motivation both directly by a number of motivational strategies, and indirectly through their planning, coordinating, personnel development, and feedback behaviors. The writers covered teamwork both organizationally and globally.

Conclusion

They have concentrated solely on the impact of the leader on team effectiveness in this article. One of their main points, however, is that this is a reciprocal relationship, in which team dynamics influence leader performance. For example, a high level of distributed expertise in teams facilitates several of the leadership functions described by Fleishman et al. (1991). Functionally diverse teams can assist leaders in interpreting ambiguity in the environment and reducing uncertainty.

Expert teams can also assist leaders in acquiring information in their boundary-spanning responsibilities, allowing them to be more effective (i.e., by acting as part of their information networks). Several boundary-spanning functions for group members were identified by Ancona and Caldwell (1988), all of which revolved around the gathering of information necessary for group effectiveness. Team members increase the team's surveillance resources by contributing to the leader's information network.

Teachings from the reading

Existing leadership and team dynamics theories tend to downplay the contributions of each of these processes to the other. As a result of this reduction, there is a lack of awareness of collaborative decision-making and performance. A significant percentage of the variable in performance in teams such as military units or those in more traditional organizational forms, which are often organized in a strong hierarchical structure, may be due to leadership issues. Failure to comprehend this relationship may stifle the training and growth of such teams and leaders. Team procedures, on the other hand, are becoming increasingly crucial as many firms

migrate away from a typical hierarchical structure and toward a more team-based structure. Such factors should be taken into account more thoroughly and modeled in organizational and strategic leadership theories.

2.

The second qualitative paper on creating effective teamwork within organizations is *“Creating high performance teamwork in organizations.”* by O’Neill & Salas (2018).

Description of the paper

In practically every aspect of modern professional life, teams are becoming more popular. They examine evidence of the complexity of modern work, industry trends in team utilization, and the challenges of realizing the full potential of organizational work teams in the current article. By compiling a targeted group of review articles for this special issue, they hoped to make a significant contribution to the science of high-performance cooperation. They address the following themes and pathways for realizing the full potential of teams: (1) collaborate across boundaries; (2) create effective team procedures and states; (3) manage team development difficulties; and (4) harness human capital. The contents of this special issue, taken together, present significant new potential for furthering future study and improving the efficacy of teams in organizations. They identify six areas in which future research efforts in high performance teamwork should be directed based on “realities” that, in their view, need to be addressed.

A well-developed, professional and scholarly article

The writers explored many challenges, reported by numerous other researchers and writers, that were involved in achieving and maintaining high performance teamwork. Wageman, Nunes, Burruss, and Hackman (2008) reported that Only 21% of leadership teams do really well, while the remaining 42% perform poorly. Hackman’s (1990) book titled “Groups that work (and those that don’t)” illustrated a plethora of difficulties and obstacles across a wide variety of team types. Teams suffer from process loss, according to Steiner (1972), because their overall production is a function of the team's potential minus coordination costs. Furthermore, teams procrastinate on assignments more than individuals do (Chang, Bordia, & Duck, 2003; Gersick, 1988). Dealing with the realities of coordinating a multi-team system, the requirement to bridge organizational boundaries, and the significance of strategic alignment across the business brings a new set of difficulties to solve (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992). As a result, they discovered numerous challenges in creating high-performance teamwork; clearly, researchers and practitioners have a lot of work ahead of them.

Current and reflective of the most recent knowledge in the area of teamwork

When they set out to create this special issue, they had one goal in mind: To meaningfully move forward the science and practice of high performance teamwork. They wanted to expand their research in this area because they believed Cross, Rebele, & Grant's (2016) theory that the adoption of teams continues to increase in almost every domain of modern work life. According to Salas et al. (2015) problems facing the world and organizations are so complex that collaboration among individuals with common objectives is fundamental. They know that teamwork matters, as effective teamwork is related to innovation, safety, fewer errors, and saving lives (e.g., Hughes et al., 2016; Hülshager, Anderson, & Salgado, 2009). Yet, high performance teamwork is difficult to achieve and most teams fail to reach their full potential.

These evaluations present essential points in terms of important aspects that influence teamwork, all of which are current and reflect the most recent information in the field.

Organizational and global teamwork

The authors, in this article, focused creating high performance teamwork solely in organizations, which was covered adequately. But there were little to none mention of the global teamwork in their paper.

Conclusion

The authors found that cross-functional workgroups may be required for organizational activities such as strategic planning and executive leadership (Long, 2020). Three attributes are critical when building successful cross-functional teams, according to Katzenbach and Smith (1992): "(a) technical or functional expertise, (b) problem-solving and decision-making skills, and (c) interpersonal skills." According to the authors, while these characteristics are important, they are not sufficient to build a team; forming a cross-functional workgroup does not guarantee benefits on its own. They aimed to expand current knowledge of team effectiveness, develop fruitful research agendas for future empirical investigations, and provide practical implications for practitioners dealing with teamwork challenges in this special issue. Teachings from the reading.

Teachings from the reading

The topics of the special issue are formed by the contents of the issue. Each topic indicates a possible set of tactics for assisting teams in realizing their full potential: (1) collaborate across borders; (2) create successful team procedures and states; (3) handle team development difficulties; and (4) utilize human capital.

According to the authors:

- Teams are embedded in multi-team systems
- Social networks within and outside the team are crucial.
- Constructs occur as a system rather than in isolation.
- Teamwork is dynamic—emerges over time.
- Psychological safety matters for Teamwork.
- Teams must be adaptive and self-adjusting social entities.

3.

The second qualitative paper on creating effective teamwork within organizations is “Understanding and improving teamwork in organizations: A scientifically based practical guide” written by Salas, Shuffler, Thayer, Bedwell, & Lazzara (2015).

Description of the paper

Their heuristic is not meant to be a comprehensive list of all teamwork considerations or a definition of collaboration; rather, it is a practical attempt to synthesize major results from a large body of literature to provide valuable advice for others outside this field of study. They begin by defining teamwork and providing a high-level understanding of the nine selected aspects. This is followed by a more in-depth examination of each aspect, which includes a summary of relevant studies and an explanation of why each factor is important in understanding collaboration. They also provide practical guidance and ideas that can be used by organizational leaders and those who are responsible for ensuring the success of teamwork. Finally, they address how this heuristic might be employed most effectively in practice and for future research.

A well-developed, professional and scholarly article

They define nine "essential considerations" that serve as a practical heuristic for HR directors to assess what is needed when they face problems involving teamwork, based on the existing vast body of research on the subject. Their heuristic is not meant to be a comprehensive list of all teamwork considerations; rather, it combines key findings from a large body of literature to provide an integrated understanding of the foundations of teamwork—specifically, what should be taken into account when forming, developing, and maintaining teams.

Current and reflective of the most recent knowledge in the area of teamwork

It is vital to explicitly define teams and teamwork in order to provide a heuristic of critical aspects for teamwork. They use a variety of teamwork literature to define teamwork.

They now shift to determining the important considerations for teamwork's efficacy, based on this definition. These important factors are based on a large body of teamwork literature that has gathered over several decades. Many studies have been conducted to highlight the various factors and processes that can affect collaboration. (e.g., Cannon-Bowers & Bowers, 2010; Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006; Marks et al., 2001; Mathieu et al., 2008; Sundstrom, McIntyre, Halfhill, & Richards, 2000).

Table I at page 3 of their paper provides a more complete list summarizing these reviews and their contributions to the teamwork literature. These reviews provide key points in terms of important factors that affect teamwork, which are all current and reflective of the most recent knowledge in the area of teamwork.

Organizational and global teamwork

This paper has the potential to make a strong impact on the future of teams and leaders in organizations, but the same can not be said for global leaders. The paper will continue to serve its purpose for organizational leadership. However, there is much ground to cover when it comes to global leaders. Nevertheless this can serve as a guiding heuristic by which individuals, teams, organizations, and other collaborating entities can determine what is needed when they face situations involving teamwork.

Conclusion

The writers concluded that it is unlikely that team-based structures will be disappearing anytime in the near future and "only through continued research efforts will their understanding of teams continue to develop and move forward. As the complexity of team tasks continues to increase, this understanding will be of ever-greater importance."

Teachings from the reading

Team composition, the context in which the team operates, and the culture of the company, team, and individuals are all factors that must be considered by teams and organizations. According to research, these factors influence the degree to which teams can successfully engage in cooperation and achieve performance goals. These characteristics matter, regardless of how well-intentioned a team is—they determine team motivations and interactions, as well

as the effectiveness of team procedures and emergent states in attaining results. As a result, if the basic processes and emergent states are not in place, teams will not necessarily be effective in ideal conditions. These two groups of considerations work together to provide a useful heuristic for teams and organizations aiming to establish and maintain collaboration.

Similarities and differences among the three papers

The authors propose a conceptual framework for thinking about leadership influences on team performance in the first article. They suggest that leadership processes have an impact on team effectiveness because of their effects on the cognitive, motivational, affective, and coordination processes. They would also argue that the amount of these effects is moderated by a number of environmental, organizational, and team variables. They provide a functional model of leadership processes after that. They then look at how leaders influence the team procedures discussed earlier.

The authors begin the second article with an overview of high-performance teamwork, including the importance of teamwork and recent industrial trends in team use. Then, based on the themes of the articles in the current special edition, they explain their options for reclaiming teams' lost potential. They wrap up with a statement about how the articles in this special issue will advance the field. As a whole, the publications suggest a number of significant overarching challenges that should be addressed in future team research. They refer to these as "realities" that teams of researchers must address, according to them. They propose this as a study agenda for future studies on high-performing work teams.

The final paper follows the most formal format. The authors begin by defining teamwork and its components. Second, they provide a high-level conceptualization and rationale for the heuristic's nine selected considerations, followed by a more in-depth synthesis of related literature and empirically-driven practical assistance. Third, they end with a discussion of how this heuristic might be employed most effectively in practice, as well as suggestions for future study on teamwork and its key concerns.

References

- Ancona, D. G., & Caldwell, D. F. (1988). Beyond task and maintenance: defining external functions in groups. *Group and Organization Studies*, 13, p. 468–494.
- Ancona, D. G., & Caldwell, D. F. (1992). Demography and design: Predictors of new product team performance. *Organization Science*, 3, p. 321–341.
- Cannon-Bowers, J. A., & Bowers, C. A. (2010). Team development and functioning. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 1. Building and developing the organization*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Chang, A., Bordia, P., & Duck, J. (2003). Punctuated equilibrium and linear progression: Toward a new understanding of group development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, p. 106–117.
- Cross, R., Rebele, R., & Grant, A. (2016). Collaborative overload. *Harvard Business Review*, 94, p. 74–79.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In: L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 1, p. 149–190. New York: Academic Press.
- Fleishman, E. A., Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Levin, K. Y., Korotkin, A. L., & Hein, M. B. (1991). Taxonomic efforts in the description of leader behavior: a synthesis and functional interpretation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(4), p. 245–287.
- Gersick, C. J. G. (1988). Time and transition in work teams: Toward a new model of group development. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 31, p. 9–41.
- Hackman, J. R. (1990). *Groups that work (and those that don't)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hackman, J. R., & Walton, R. E. (1986). Leading groups in organizations. In: P. S. Goodman, et al. (Eds.), *Designing effective work groups* (p. 72–119). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hirokawa, R. Y. (1980). A comparative analysis of communication patterns within effective and ineffective decision-making groups. *Communication Monographs*, 47, p. 312–321.
- Hughes, A. M., Gregory, M. E., Joseph, D. L., Sonesh, S. C., Marlow, S. L., Lacerenza, C. N., & Salas, E. (2016). Saving lives: A meta-analysis of team training in healthcare. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, p. 1266–1304.
- Hülshager, U. R., Anderson, N., & Salgado, J. F. (2009). Team-level predictors of innovation at work: A comprehensive meta-analysis spanning three decades of research. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, p. 1128–1145.
- Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22, p. 375–403.

Kerr, S., Schriesheim, C. A., Murphy, C. J., & Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Toward a theory of leadership based upon the consideration and initiating structure literature. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 12, p. 62–82.

Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Ilgen, D. R. (2006). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 7(3), 77–124.

Kozlowski, S. W. J., Gully, S. M., Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (1996). Team leadership and development: theory, principles, and guidelines for training leaders and teams. In: M. M. Beyerlein, D. Johnson, & S. T. Beyerlein (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary studies of work teams: vol. 3. Team leadership* (p. 251–289). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Levine, J. M., & Moreland, R. L. (1990). Progress in small group research. *American Review of Psychology*, 41, p. 585–614.

Long, S. (2020). *Developing Trust in a Cross-Functional Workgroup: Assessing the Effectiveness of a Communication Intervention*.

Marks, M. A., Mathieu, J. E., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2001). A temporally based framework and taxonomy of team processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3), 356–376.

Mathieu, J. E., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997–2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 410–476.

McGrath, J. E. (1991). Time, interaction, and performance (TIP): a theory of groups. *Small Group Research*, 22, p. 147–174.

McIntyre, R. M., & Salas, E. (1995). Measuring and managing for team performance: lessons from complex environments. In: R. A. Guzzo, & E. Salas (Eds.), *Teams effectiveness and decision making in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Neill, T. A., & Salas, E. (2018). Creating high performance teamwork in organizations. *Human Resource Management Review*. 28(4). p. 325-331. Retrieved from: <http://tarjomefa.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/263-English-TarjomeFa.pdf>

Salas, E., Shuffler, M. L., Thayer, A. L., Bedwell, W. L., & Lazzara, E. H. (2015). Understanding and improving teamwork in organizations: A scientifically based practical guide. *Human Resource Management*. 54(4). p. 599–622. Retrieved from: [https://www.salonedimpresa.it/wp-content/uploads/Salas et al-2014-Human Resource Management-1.pdf](https://www.salonedimpresa.it/wp-content/uploads/Salas_et_al-2014-Human_Resource_Management-1.pdf)

Steiner, I. D. (1972). *Group process and productivity*. New York NY: Academic Press.

Sundstrom, E., McIntyre, M., Halfhill, T., & Richards, H. (2000). Work groups: From the Hawthorne studies to work teams of the 1990s and beyond. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 4(1), 44–67.

Wageman, R., Nunes, D. A., Burruss, J. A., & Hackman, J. R. (2008). Senior leadership teams: What it takes to make them great. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In: M. D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., vol. 3) (p. 147–197). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Zaccaro, S. J., Rittman, A. L., & Marks, M. A. (2001). Team leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12(4), p. 451-483. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(01\)00093-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00093-5)