

## Introduction

This chapter will look at teams, team development and change from a number of perspectives and will be asking a number of pertinent questions:

- e What is a group and when is it a team?
- e Why do you need teams?
- e What types of organizational teams are there?
- e How do you improve team effectiveness?
- @ What does team change look like?
- e What are the leadership issues in team change?
- e What are the main dysfunctions of a team?
- e How do individuals affect team dynamics?
- e How well do teams initiate and adapt to organizational change?
- e How can you develop team resilience?

The chapter aims to enhance understanding of the nature of teams and how they develop, identify how teams perform in change situations, and develop strategies for managing teams through change and change through teams.

We open with a discussion around what constitutes a group and what constitutes a team. We will also look at the phenomena of different types of teams: for example, virtual teams, self-organizing teams and project teams.

Models of team functioning, change and development will be explored. We look at the various components of teamworking, and at how teams develop and how different types of people combine to make a really effective (or not) team.

We take as our basic model Tuckman's (1965) model of team development to illustrate how teams change over time. This is the forming, storming, norming and performing model. But we will add to it by differentiating between the task aspects of team development and the people aspects of team development.

Finally we look at the way in which teams can impact or react to organizational change and how to build a team's resilience.

## The underpinning theory

What is a group and when is it a team?

There has been much academic discussion as to what constitutes a team and what constitutes a group. In much of the literature the two terms are used indistinguishably. Yet there are crucial differences, and anyone working in an organization instinctively knows when he or she is in a team and when he or she is in a group. We will attempt to clarify the essential similarities and differences. This is important when looking at change because teams and groups experience change in different ways.

Schein and Bennis (1965) suggest that a group is 'any number of people who interact with each other, are psychologically aware of each other, and who perceive themselves to be a group'. Morgan et al (1986) suggest that 'a team is a distinguishable set of two or more individuals who interact interdependently and adaptively to achieve specified, shared, and valued objectives'. Sundstrom et al (1990) define the work team as 'A small group of individuals who share responsibility for outcomes for their organizations.'

Cohen and Bailey (1997) define a team as 'a collection of individuals who are interdependent in their tasks, who share responsibility for outcomes, who see themselves and who are seen by others as an intact social entity embedded in one or more larger social systems (for example, business unit or the corporation), and who manage their relationships across organizational boundaries'. Our own list of differentiators appears in Table 2.1.

A group is a collection of individuals who draw a boundary around themselves. Or perhaps we from the outside might draw a boundary around them and thus define them as a group. A team on the other hand, with its common purpose, is

Table 2.1 Differences between groups and teams

Group	Team or work group
-------	--------------------

Indeterminate size	Restricted in size
--------------------	--------------------

Common interests	Common overarching objectives
------------------	-------------------------------

Sense of being part of something or seen as being part of something	Interaction between members to accomplish individual and group goals
---	--

Interdependent as much as individuals might wish to be	Interdependency between members to accomplish individual and group goals
--	--

May have no responsibilities other than a sense of belonging to the group	Shared responsibilities
---	-------------------------

May have no accountabilities other than 'contractual' ones	Individual accountabilities
--	-----------------------------

A group does not necessarily have any work to do or goals to accomplish  
The team works together, physically or virtually

## Team change

generally tighter and clearer about what it is and what its *raison d'être* is. Its members know exactly who is involved and what their goal is. Of course it turns out that we are speaking hypothetically here, as any one of us has seen teams within organizations that appear to have no sense at all of what they are really about!

Let us illustrate the difference between a team and a group by using an example. We might look into an organization and see the Finance Department. The Finance Controller heads up a Finance Management Team that leads, manages and coordinates the activities within this area. The team members work together on common goals, meet regularly and have clearly defined roles and responsibilities (usually).

Perhaps the senior management team has decreed that all the high-potential managers in the organization shall be members of the Strategic Management Group. So the finance controller, who is on the high-potential list, gets together with others at his or her level to form a collection of individuals who contribute to the overall strategic direction of the organization. Apart from gatherings every six months, this group rarely meets or communicates. It is a grouping, which might be bounded but does not have any ongoing goals or objectives that require members to work together.

### STOP AND THINK!

Q2.1 Within your working life, what teams are you a member of and to which groups do you belong?

Q2.2 Within your personal life, what teams are you a member of and to which groups do you belong?

Q2.3 In what ways was it easier to answer in your personal life, and in what ways more difficult?

Q2.4 What might be some of the differences for a team and a group going through organizational change?

### Why we need teams

Why do we need teams and teamworking? Casey (1993), from Ashridge Management College, researched this question by asking a simple question of each team he worked with: 'Why

should you work together as a team?'

The simplest answer is, 'Because of the work we need to accomplish' Teamwork may be needed because there is a high volume of interconnected pieces of work, or because the work is too complex to be understood and worked on by one person.

## The underpinning theory

What about managers? Do they need to operate as teams, or can they operate effectively as groups? The Ashridge-based writers say that a management team does not necessarily have to be fully integrated as a team all of the time. Nor should it be reduced to a mere collection of individuals going about their own individual functional tasks.

Casey believes that there is a clear link between the level of uncertainty of the task being handled and the level of teamwork needed. The greater the uncertainty, the greater the need for teamwork. The majority of management teams deal with both uncertain and certain tasks, so need to be flexible about the levels of teamworking required. Decisions about health and safety, HR policy, reporting processes and recruitment are relatively certain, so can be handled fairly quickly without a need for much sharing of points of view. There is usually a right answer to these issues, whereas decisions about strategy, structure and culture are less certain. There is no right answer, and each course of action involves taking a risk. This means more teamworking, more sharing of points of view, and a real understanding of what is being agreed and what the implications are for the team.

## The types of organizational teams

Robert Keidal (1984) identified a parallel between sports teams and organizational teams. He uses baseball, American football and basketball teams to show the differences.

A baseball team is like a sales organization. Team members are relatively independent of one another, and while all members are required to be on the field together, they virtually never interact together all at the same time.

Football is quite different. There are really three subteams within the total team: offence, defence and the special team. When the subteam is on the field, every player is involved in every play, which is not the case in baseball. But the teamwork is centred in the subteam, not the total team.

Basketball is a different breed. Here the team is small, with all players in only one team. Every player is involved in all aspects of the game, offence and defence, and all must pass, run, shoot. When a substitute comes in, all must play with the new person.

Many different types of team exist within organizations. Let us look at a range of types of team found in today's organizations (see Table 2.2).

## Team change

### Work team

Work teams or work groups are typically the type of team that most people within organizations will think of when we talk about teams. They are usually part of the normal hierarchical structure of an organization. This means that one person manages a group of individuals, and that person is responsible for delivering a particular product or service either to the customer or to another part of the organization.

These teams tend to be relatively stable in terms of team objectives, processes and personnel. Their agenda is normally focused on maintenance and management of what is. This is a combination of existing processes and operational strategy. Any change agenda they have is usually on top of their existing agenda of meeting the current operating plan.

### Self-managed team

A sub-set of the work team is the self-managed team. The self-managed team has the attributes of the work team but without a direct manager or supervisor. This affects

## Table 2.2 Types of team

Team Group	Work	Parallel	Matrix
Continuity	Variable	Stable	Stable or one-off
project structure but fluid by project			Stable as a
Lifespan	Variable	Unlimited	Variable
Organizational	Can be part of	Part of	Outside of normal
links the formal and/or informal structure	management	management	Part of management
organization accountability	structure, Dual		
Led by	Dependent on	One	Normally
nature and manager	or coordinated	or	Project manager
purpose of group	supervisor	facilitated	head
Location	Variable	Co-located	Converge for
meetings dispersed, virtual			Co-located,
Purpose	Variable	Business as	Maintenance
usual function or part of change		Project	Project
'infrastructure'			
Authority	Dependent on	Through the	Depends
nature and line	accountability		Dual
purpose of group			
Focus	Communication	Task	Communication
	Task	Task	Task

(continued )

The underpinning theory

Table 2.2. (Continued)

Management	Team	Virtual	Network	ment	Project	Change
Continuity	Potential	fluid	Potential	fluid	Stable	Focused on Fluid
project	achievement					
Lifespan	Variable	Variable	Unlimited	Time limited	Variable	
Organization-	Can be part	More	Part of	Separate	Variable	
al links of the distributed management	management					
management across the structure	structure					
structure organization						
Led by	One manager	Potentially	One manager	Project	Sponsor or	
or supervisor	distributed	manager	change			
leadership or manager	coordination					
Location	Dispersed	Dispersed	Often co-	Colocated,	Co-located,	
located	dispersed,	dispersed,				
virtual	virtual					
Purpose	BAU or Change	or Business as	Change or	Change and		
project development	usual development	develop-				
Change and	ment					
development						
Authority	Through the	Depends	Through the	Via project	Via project	
line or project	line manager	manager				
manager and project	—	and project				
sponsor	sponsor					
Focus	Task	Communica-	Task and	Task	Task and	
tion	communica-	communi-				
tion	cation					

the way decisions are made and the way in which individual and team performance is managed. Generally this is through collective or distributed leadership. For an interesting perspective please see the section on self-governing structures (Laloux and Robertson) in Chapter 3.

Parallel team

Parallel teams are different from work teams because they are not part of the traditional management hierarchy. They are run in tandem or parallel to this structure. Examples of parallel teams are:

e teams brought together to deliver quality improvement (for example, quality circles, continuous improvement groups);

## Team change

e teams that have some problem-solving or decision-making input, other than the normal line management processes (for example, creativity and innovation

groups);

e teams formed to involve and engage employees (for example, staff councils, diagonal slice groups);

e teams set up for a specific purpose such as a task force looking at an office move;

e interdisciplinary teams, which are cross-functional and formed to ensure the necessary knowledge, skills and expertise to address a specific organizational issue.

These teams have variable longevity, and are used for purposes that tend to be other than the normal 'business as usual' management. They are often of a consultative nature, carrying limited authority. Although not necessarily responsible or accountable for delivering changes, they often feed into a change management process.

In order for these teams to be successful Piercy et al (2013) say there needs to be high-level leadership and sponsorship with focus on ensuring the prevailing culture doesn't block their activities. Additionally there needs to be a recognition of differing levels of knowledge and a variety of perspectives, which can require team building and training. The more that team members have opted in rather than been coerced the better the level of commitment and performance. They state: "The more representative a team is of the organization as a whole (ie including members of all relevant functions or departments, from different levels in the organizational hierarchy), the greater the likelihood of successful outcomes".

## Matrix team

Matrix teams generally occur in organizations that are run along project lines. The organization typically has to deliver a number of projects to achieve its objectives. Each project has a project manager, but the project team members are drawn from functional areas of the organization. Often projects are clustered together to form programmes, or indeed whole divisions or business units (for example, aerospace, defence or oil industry projects). Thus the team members have accountability both to the project manager and to their functional head. The balance of power between the projects and the functions varies from organization to organization, and the success of such structures often depends on the degree to which the project teams are enabled by the structure and the degree to which they are disabled.

## Virtual team

Increasing globalization and developments in the use of new technologies mean that teams are not necessarily co-located any more. This has been true for many years for

## The underpinning theory

sales teams. Virtual teams either never meet or they meet only rarely. Townsend et al (1998) defined virtual teams as ‘groups of geographically and/or organizationally dispersed co-workers that are assembled using a combination of telecommunications and information technologies to accomplish an organizational task’. An advantage of virtual teams is that an organization can use the most appropriately skilled people for the task, wherever they are located. In larger companies the probability that the necessary and desired expertise for any sophisticated or complex task is in the same place geographically is low.

Disadvantages spring from the distance between team members. Virtual teams cross time zones, countries, continents and cultures. All these things create their own set of challenges. Current research suggests that synchronous working (face-to-face or remote) is more effective in meeting more complex challenges. Team leadership for virtual teams also creates its own issues, with both day-to-day management tasks and developmental interventions being somewhat harder from a distance.

When it comes to change, virtual teams are somewhat paradoxical. Team members can perhaps be more responsive, balancing autonomy and interdependence, and more focused on their part of the team objective. However, change creates an increased need for communication, clear goals, defined roles and responsibilities, and support and recognition processes. These things are more difficult to manage in the virtual world.

Erich Barthel (*Building relationships and working in teams across cultures*) and Inger Buus (*Leading in a virtual environment*) write about this in more detail in *Leadership and Personal Development* (2011).

## Networked team

National, international and global organizations can use networked teams in an attempt to add a greater cohesion, which would not otherwise be there. Additionally they may wish to capture learning in one part and spread it across the whole organization.

We might have grouped virtual and networked teams under the same category. However, we could think of the networked team as being similar to a parallel team, in the sense that its primary purpose is not business as usual, but part of an attempt by the organization to increase sustainability and build capacity through increasing the reservoir of knowledge across the whole organization.

Networked teams are an important anchor for organizations in times of change. They can be seen as part of the glue that gives a sense of cohesion to people within the organization. Various types of networked teams, or groups, drawn from knowledge management and organizational learning concepts might be included here, for example, communities of practice, knowledge cafés and reference groups.

## Team change

Kotter (2012) building on his earlier work (1996) suggests that ‘The most agile, innovative companies add a second operating system, built on a fluid, network-like structure, to continually formulate and implement strategy. [This] second operating system runs on its own processes and is staffed by volunteers from throughout the company.’ Kotter’s current thinking is looked at in more detail in Chapter 3, Organizational change.

## Management team

Management teams coordinate and provide direction to the sub-units under their jurisdiction, laterally integrating interdependent sub-units across key business processes.

(Mohrman et al, 1995)

The management team is ultimately responsible for the overall performance of the business unit. In itself it may not deliver any product, service or project, but clearly its function is to enable that delivery. Management teams are pivotal in translating the organization’s overarching goals into specific objectives for the various sub-units to do their share of the organization task.

Management teams are similar to work teams in terms of delivery of current operational plan, but are much more likely to be in a position of designing and delivering change as well. We expect a more senior management team to spend less time on ‘business as usual’ matters and more time on the change agenda.

The senior management team in any organization is the team most likely to be held responsible for the organization’s ultimate success or failure. It is in a pivotal position within the organization. On the one hand it is at the top of the organization, and therefore team members have a collective leadership responsibility; on the other, it is accountable to the non-executive board and shareholders in limited companies, or to politicians in local and central government, or to trustees in not-for-profit organizations. Along with the change team (see below) the management team has a particular role to play within most change scenarios, for it is its members who initiate and manage the implementation of change.

## Project team

Project teams are teams that are formed for the specific purpose of completing a project. They therefore are time limited, and we would expect to find clarity of objectives. The project might be focused on an external client or it might be an internal one-off, or cross-cutting project with an internal client group.

Depending on the scale of the project the team might comprise individuals on a full- or part-time basis. Typically there is a project manager, selected for his or her specialist or managerial skills, and a project sponsor. Individuals report to the project

## The underpinning theory

manager for the duration of the project (although if they work part-time on the project they might also be reporting to a line manager). The project manager reports to the project sponsor, who typically is a senior manager.

We know the project team has been successful when it delivers the specific project on time, to quality and within budget. Brown and Eisenhardt (1995) noted that cross-functional teams, which are teams comprised of individuals from a range of organizational functions, were found to enhance project success.

Project teams are very much associated with implementing change. However, although change may be their very *raison d'être* it does not necessarily mean that their members' ability to handle change is any different from the rest of us. Indeed built into their structure are potential dysfunctions:

- e The importance of task achievement often reigns supreme, at the expense of investing time in meeting individual and team maintenance needs.

- e The fact that individuals have increased uncertainty concerning their future can impact on motivation and performance.

- e The dynamic at play between the project team and the organizational area into which the change will take place can be problematic.

## Change team

Change teams are often formed within organizations when a planned or unplanned change of significant proportions is necessary. We have separated out this type of team because of its special significance. Sometimes the senior management team is called the change team, responsible for directing and sponsoring the changes. Sometimes the change team is a special project team set up to implement change. At other times the change team is a parallel team, set up to tap into the organization and be a conduit for feedback as to how the changes are being received.

Obviously different organizations have different terminologies, so what in one organization is called a project team delivering a change will be a change team delivering a project in another organization.

More and more organizations also realize that the management of change is more likely to succeed if attention is given to the people side of change. Hence a parallel team drawn from representatives of the whole workforce can be a useful adjunct in terms of assessing and responding to the impact of the changes on people.

We see the change team as an important starting point in the change process. Research by one of the authors (Green, 2007a) and Prosci (2003, 2007, 2014, 2018) suggests the criticality of a credible effective dedicated change management team.

The effective interaction between the senior management team, the local line

management team, the project team and the change management team is crucial.

## Team change

Often this is enabled by having a steering committee overseeing the change implementation. Chapter 5 continues this discussion.

### STOP AND THINK!

Q2.5 Of the teams of which you are a member, which are more suitable to lead change and which more suitable to implement change? Justify your answer.

Q2.6 Who should be responsible for managing communications and alignment across the organization's teams and groups?

## How to improve team effectiveness

Rollin and Christine Glaser (1992) have identified five elements that contribute to the level of a team's effectiveness or ineffectiveness over time. They are:

1 team mission, planning and goal setting;

2 team roles;

3 team operating processes;

4 team interpersonal relationships; and

5 inter-team relations.

If you can assess where a team is in terms of its ability to address these five elements, you will discover what it needs to do to develop into a fully functioning team.

## Team mission planning and goal setting

A number of studies have found that the most effective teams have a strong sense of their purpose, organize their work around that purpose, and plan and set goals in line with that purpose. Larson and LaFasto (1989) report: 'in every case, without exception, when an effectively functioning team was identified, it was described by the respondent as having a clear understanding of its objective'.

Clarity of objectives together with a common understanding and agreement of these was seen to be key. In addition Locke and Latham (1984) report that the very act of goal setting was a prime motivator for the team; the more your team sets clear goals the more likely it is to succeed. They also reported a 16 per cent average improvement in effectiveness for teams that use goal setting as an integral part of team activities.

## The underpinning theory

Clear goals are even more important when teams are involved in change, partly because unless they know where they are going they are unlikely to get there, and partly because a strong sense of purpose can mitigate some of the more harmful effects of change. The downside occurs when a team rigidly adheres to its purpose when in fact the world has moved on and other objectives are more appropriate.

## Team roles

The best way for a team to achieve its goals is for the team to be structured logically around those goals. Individual team members need to have clear roles and accountabilities. They need to have a clear understanding not only of what their individual role is, but also what the roles and accountabilities of other team members are.

When change happens — within, to or by the team - clarity about roles has two useful functions. It provides a clear sense of purpose and it provides a supportive framework for task accomplishment. However, during change the situation becomes more fluid. Too much rigidity results in tasks falling down the gaps between roles, or overlaps going unnoticed. It might result in team members being less innovative or proactive or courageous.

## Team operating processes

A team needs to have certain enabling processes in place for people to carry out their work together. Certain things are needed to allow the task to be achieved in a way that is as efficient and as effective as possible. Glaser and Glaser (1992) comment: ‘both participation in all of the processes of the work group and the development of a collaborative approach are at the heart of effective group work. Because of the tradition of autocratic leadership, neither participation nor collaboration are natural or automatic processes. Both require some learning and practice’

Typical areas that a team need actively to address by discussing and agreeing include:

e frequency, timing and agenda of meetings;

e problem-solving and decision-making methodologies;

© ground rules;

e procedures for dealing with conflict when it occurs;

e reward mechanisms for individuals contributing to team goals;

® type and style of review process.

## Team change

In the turbulence created by change, all these areas will come under additional stress and strain, hence the need for processes to have been discussed and agreed at an earlier stage. During times of change when typically pressures and priorities can push people into silo mentality and away from the team, the team operating processes can act like a lubricant, enabling healthy team functioning to continue.

## Team interpersonal relationships

The team members must actively communicate among themselves. To achieve clear understanding of goals and roles, the team needs to work together to agree and clarify them. Operating processes must also be discussed and agreed.

To achieve this level of communication, the interpersonal relationships within the team need to be in a relatively healthy state. Glaser and Glaser (1992) found that the literature on team effectiveness ‘prescribes open communication that is assertive and task focused, as well as creating opportunities for giving and receiving feedback aimed at the development of a high trust climate’.

In times of change, individual stress levels rise and there is a tendency to focus more on the task than the people processes. High levels of trust within a team are the bedrock for coping with conflict.

## Inter-team relations

Teams cannot work in isolation with any real hope of achieving their organizational objectives. The nature of organizations today — complex, sophisticated and with increasingly loose and permeable boundaries — creates situations where a team’s goals can rarely be achieved without input from and output to others.

However smart a team has been in addressing the previous four categories, the authors have found in consulting with numerous organizations that attention needs to be paid to inter-team relations now more

than ever before. This is because of the rise

of strategic partnerships and global organizations. Teams need to connect more. It is also because the environment is changing faster and is more complex, so keeping in touch with information outside of your own team is a basic survival strategy.

The underpinning theory

STOP AND THINK!

02.7 Using the five elements above, what is your current team effectiveness? If not in a team perhaps use the group of people you interact most with in your working life.

02.8 What needs to change, and how would you go about it?

What team change looks like

All teams go through a change process when they are first formed, and when significant events occur such as a new member arriving, a key member leaving, a change of scope, increased pressure from outside, or a change in organizational climate.

Tuckman (1965) is one of the most widely quoted of researchers into the linear model of team development. His work is regularly used in team building within organizations. Most people will have heard of it as the 'forming, storming, norming, performing' model of team development. His basic premise is that any team will undergo distinct stages of development as it works or struggles towards effective team functioning. Although we will describe Tuckman's model in some detail, we have selected a range of models to illustrate the team development process, as shown in Table 2.4.

Tuckman's model of team change

Forming 208 ONAN

Forming is the first stage. This involves % Po" ye é

. | 2 Ry} A N

the team asking a set of fundamental 5! Air, oo s

. iy} ° °

questions: °

aE

e@ What is our primary purpose? :

e How do we structure ourselves as a team to achieve our purpose?

e@ What roles do we each have?

@ Who is the leader?

e How will we work together?

e How will we relate together?

e@ What are the boundaries of the team?

If we were to take a logical rational view of the team we could imagine that this could all be accomplished relatively easily and relatively painlessly. And sometimes,

## Effective and ineffective teams

Team mission,  
planning and  
goal setting

Team roles

Team operating  
processes

Team interpersonal  
relationships

Inter-team re

re

and  
oriented

;  
less  
and  
oriented

Clarity of goals and  
clear direction lead  
to greater task  
accomplishment  
and increased  
motivation.

Lack of purpose and  
unclear goals result  
in dissipation of  
energy and effort.

Clear roles and  
responsibilities  
increase individual  
accountability and  
allow others to  
work at their tasks.

Unclear roles and  
responsibilities lead  
to increased conflict  
and reduced

accountability.

Problem solving and decision making are smoother and faster. Processes enable task accomplishment without undue conflict.

Unclear operating processes increase time and effort needed to progress task achievement.

Open data flow and high levels of team working leading to task accomplishment in a supportive environment.

Dysfunctional team working causes tensions, conflict, stress and insufficient focus on task accomplishment.

Working across boundaries ens organizational  $\phi$  more likely to k achieved.

Teams working isolation or aga teams reduce t likelihood of organizational  $\phi$  achievement.

The underpinning theory

Table 2.4 Key attributes in the stages of team development

Tuckman  
(1965)

Modlin and  
Faris (1956)

Whittaker  
(1970)

Scott Peck  
(1990)

Forming

Attempt at

establishing primary

purpose, structure,  
roles, leader, task  
and process  
relationships, and  
boundaries of the  
team

Structuralism

Attempt to recreate

previous power  
within new team  
structures

Preaffiliation

Sense of unease,  
unsure of team

engagement, which

is superficial

Pseudocommunity

Members try to

fake teamliness

Storming

Dealing with  
arising conflicts  
surrounding key  
questions from  
forming stage

Unrest

Attempt to  
resolve power  
and  
interpersonal  
issues

Power and  
control

Focus on who  
has power and  
authority within  
the team  
Attempt to  
define roles

Chaos

Attempt to  
establish  
pecking order  
and team  
norms

Norming

Settling down  
of team  
dynamic and  
stepping into  
team norms  
and agreed  
ways of  
working

Change

Roles emerge  
based on task  
and people  
needs

Sense of team  
emerges

Intimacy

Team begins to  
commit to task  
and engage  
with one  
another

Emptiness

Giving up of  
expectations,  
assumptions  
and hope of  
achieving  
anything

Performing

Team is now  
ready and  
enabled to  
focus primarily  
on its task  
while attending  
to individual  
and team  
maintenance  
needs

Integration

Team purpose  
and structure  
emerge and  
accepted,  
action towards  
team goals

Differentiation

Ability to be  
clear about  
individual roles  
and  
interactions  
become  
workmanlike

Community

Acceptance of  
each other and  
focus on the  
task

(continued)

Team change

Table 2.4 (Continued)

Schutz (1982) In or out Top or bottom Near or far  
Members decide Focus on who \_ Finding levels  
whether they are has power and = of commitment  
part of the team or authority within and  
not the team engagement

within their  
roles

Hill and Orientation Exploration Production

Gruner(1973)

Structure sought Exploration Clarity of team  
around team roles and team  
roles and cohesion  
relations

Bion' (1961) Dependency Fight or flight Pairing  
Team members Team members Team  
invest the leaders challenge the members form  
with all the power leaders or other pairings in an  
and authority members attempt to

Team members resolve their  
withdraw anxieties

' Bion's insights refer to observed phenomena and do not imply a sequence.

on short projects with less than five team members, it is. However, human beings are

not completely logical rational creatures, and sometimes this process is difficult. We  
all have emotions, personalities, unique characteristics and personal motivations.

As we saw when we were exploring individual change, human beings react to

change in different ways. And the formation of a new team is about individuals ad-

justing to change in their own individual ways.

Initially the questions may be answered in rather a superficial fashion. The pri-

mary task of the team might be that which was written down in a memo from the  
departmental head, along with the structure they first thought of. The leader might  
typically have been appointed beforehand and 'imposed' upon the team. Individuals'  
roles are agreed to in an initial and individual cursory meeting with the team leader.

The team may agree to relate via a set of ground rules using words that nobody could possibly object to, but nobody knows what they really mean in practice: 'be honest', 'team before self', 'have fun', and so on.

### Storming

Tuckman's next stage is storming. This is a description of the dynamic that occurs when a team of individuals come together to work on a common task, and have

## The underpinning theory

passed through the phase of being nice to one another and not voicing their individual concerns. This dynamic occurs as the team strives or struggles to answer fully the questions postulated in the forming stage.

Statements articulated (or left unsaid) in some fashion or form might include ones such as:

e I don't think we should be aiming for that.

e This structure hasn't taken account of this.

e There are rather a lot of grey areas in our individual accountabilities.

e Why was he appointed as team leader when he hasn't done this before?

e I don't know whether I can work productively with these people.

e How can we achieve our goals without the support from others in the organization?

An alternative word to storming is 'testing'. Individuals and the team as a whole are testing out the assumptions that had been made when the team was originally formed. Obviously different teams will experience this stage with different degrees of intensity, but important points to note here are:

e it is a natural part of the process;

e it is a healthy part of the process;

e it is an important part of the process.

The storming phase — if successfully traversed — will achieve clarity on all the fundamental questions of the first phase, and enable common understanding of purpose and roles to be achieved. In turn it allows the authority of the team leader to be seen and acknowledged, and it allows everyone to take up his or her rightful place within the team. It also gives team members a sense of the way things will happen within the team. It becomes a template for future ways of acting, problem solving, decision making and relating.

## Norming

The third stage of team development occurs when the team finally settles down into working towards achievement of its task without too much attention needed on the fundamental questions. As further challenges develop, or as individuals grow further into their roles, then further scrutiny of the fundamental questions may happen. They may be discussed, but if they instead remain hidden beneath the surface this can result in loss of attention on the primary task.

Tuckman suggests in his review of the research that this settling process can be relatively straightforward and sequential. The team moves through the storming

phase into a way of working that establishes team norms. It can also be more

## Team change

sporadic and turbulent, with the team needing further storming before team norms are established. Indeed some readers might have experienced teams that permanently move back and forth between the norming and storming stages — a clear signal that some team issues are not being surfaced and dealt with.

## Performing

The final stage of team development is performing. The team has successfully traversed the three previous stages and therefore has clarity about its purpose, its structure and its roles. It has engaged in a rigorous process of working out how it should work and relate together, and is comfortable with the team norms it has established. Not only has the team worked these things through, but it has embodied them as a way of working. It has developed a capacity to change and develop, and has learnt how to learn.

The team can quite fruitfully get on with the task in hand and attend to individual and team needs at the same time.

## Adjourning

A fifth stage was later added that acknowledged that teams do not last for ever. This stage represents the period when the team's task has been completed and team members disperse. Some practitioners call this stage mourning, highlighting the emotional component. Others call it transforming as team members develop other ways of working.

The leadership issues in team change

## FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Ralph Stacey, in his book *Strategic Management and Organisational Dynamics* (1993), describes what happens when a group is brought together to study the experience of being in a group, without any further task and without an appointed leader. Known as a Group Relations Conference and run by the Tavistock Institute in London, this process involves a consultant who forms part of the group to offer views on the group process but otherwise takes no conscious part in the activity. This

always provokes high levels of anxiety in the participants... which... find expression in all manner of strange behaviours. Group discussions take on a manic form with asinine comments and hysterical laughter... the participants attack the visiting consultant... becoming incredibly rude....

## The underpinning theory

Members try to replace the non-functioning consultant... but they rarely seem to be successful in this endeavour. They begin to pick on an individual, usually some highly individualistic or minority member of the group, and then treat this person as some kind of scapegoat. They all become very concerned with remaining part of the group, greatly fearing exclusion. They show strong tendencies to conform to rapidly established group norms and suppress their individual differences, perhaps they are afraid of becoming the scapegoat... the one thing they hardly do at all is to examine the behaviour they are indulging in, the task they have actually been given.

The situation described in the box offers a way of exploring some of the unconscious group processes that are at work just below the surface. These are not always visible in more conventional team situations. The work of Bion (1961) and Scott Peck (1990) is useful to illuminate some of the phenomena that can be observed and experienced in groups, and highlight the challenges for leaders.

## Moving through dependency

In any team formation the first thing people look for is someone to tell them what to do. This is a perfectly natural phenomenon, given that many people will want to get on with the task and many people will believe someone else knows what the task is and how it should be done.

In any unfamiliar situation or environment people can become dependent. Jon Stokes (in Obholzer and Roberts, 1994) describes what Bion observed in his experience with groups and called basic group assumptions:

a group dominated by basic assumption of dependency behaves as if its primary task is solely to provide for the satisfaction of the needs and wishes of its members. The leader is expected to look after, protect and sustain the members of the group, to make them feel

good, and not to face them with the demands of the group's real purpose.

The job of the leader, and indeed the group, is not only to establish leadership credibility and accountability but to establish its limits. This will imbue the rest of the team with sufficient power for them to accomplish their tasks. The leader can do this by modelling the taking of individual responsibility and empowering others to do the same, and by ensuring that people are oriented in the right direction and have a common understanding of team purpose and objectives.

## Team change

### Moving through conflict

Bion's second assumption is labelled 'fight or flight'. Bion (1961) says:

There is a danger or 'enemy', which should either be attacked or fled from ... members look to the leader to devise some appropriate action... for instance, instead of considering how best to organize its work, a team may spend most of the time worrying about rumours of organizational change. This provides a sense of togetherness, whilst also serving to avoid facing the difficulties of the work itself. Alternatively, such a group may spend its time protesting angrily, without actually planning any specific action to deal with the perceived threat.

The threat might not necessarily be coming from outside, but instead might be an externalization — or projection — from the team. The real threat is from within, and the potential for conflict is between the leader and the rest of the team, and between team members themselves. Issues about power and authority and where people sit in the 'pecking order' may surface at this stage.

The leadership task here is to surface any of these dynamics and work them through, either by the building of trust and the frank, open and honest exchange of views, or by seeking clarity and gaining agreement on roles and responsibilities.

### Moving towards creativity

The third assumption that Bion explored was that of pairing. This is:

based on the collective and unconscious belief that, whatever the actual problems and needs of the group, a future event will solve them. The group behaves as if pairing or coupling between two members within the group, or perhaps between the leaders of the group and some external person, will bring about salvation... the group is in fact not interested in working practically towards this future, but only sustaining a vague sense of hope as a way out of its current difficulties... members are inevitably left with a sense of disappointment and failure, which is quickly superseded by a hope that the next meeting will be better.

Once again there is a preoccupation. This time it is about creating something new, but in a fantasized or unreal way, as a defence against doing anything practical or actually performing. The antidote of course is for the leader to encourage the team members to continue in their endeavours and to take personal responsibility for moving things on. Collaborative working requires greater openness of communication and data flow.

The underpinning theory

Moving through cohesion and cosiness

Turquet (1974) has added a fourth assumption, labelled 'oneness'. This is where the team seems to believe it has come together almost for a higher purpose, or with a higher force, so the members can lose themselves in a sense of complete unity.

There are parallels to the stage of performing but somehow, once again, the team has fallen into an unconscious detraction from the primary task in hand. Attainment of a sense of oneness, cohesiveness or indeed cosiness is not the purpose the team set out to achieve. Good and close teamworking is often essential and can be individually satisfying, but it is not the purpose. Too much focus on team cohesion can lead to abdication from the task, and is only a stage on the way to full teamworking. The goal is interdependent working co-existing with collaborative problem solving. This requires the leader to set the scene and the pace, and team members to act with maturity.

See Chapter 4 for more ideas on leading change.

Team dysfunctions

Lencioni's five dysfunctions of a team

Lencioni's *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team* was published in 2002 and became an international bestseller. Although not a research-based book many internal and external consultants and team facilitators have used his ideas to develop teams, both in times of change and otherwise.

Lencioni identified five dysfunctions that teams might have, and which need to be worked through in order to become high performing. He believed that the fundamental obstacle can be an absence of trust and the team needs to address that before it can move on to the next level. He conceived of five dimensions or building blocks in the shape of a pyramid, which needed to be addressed:

From distrust to trust

Trust can be defined as the 'reliance on the character, ability, strength, or truth of someone or something'

MERRIAM-WEBSTER ONLINE DICTIONARY (ND)

Team members need to move from being closed with their own feelings and thoughts towards being willing to be open and honest about their own mistakes and vulnerabilities, to be keen to learn from any mistakes, and be open to supporting their team colleagues in exploring theirs. The more team members can believe that their colleagues

## Team change

will deliver on what they need to, the greater the belief and the trust in each other. Being able to reveal one's weaknesses is a true leadership characteristic according to Goffee and Jones (2000) and engenders trust. This is especially important when facing the risks and anxieties associated with change, particularly when heading into unknown territory. Paradoxically, by revealing a degree of uncertainty, this can lead to a greater confidence in the leaders by the followers.

### From conflict avoidance to willingness to engage in conflict

Once you know you can trust people the robustness of the conversations the team can have increases. However, many people are averse to conflict and avoid interactions that might hurt another's feelings or provoke a defensive or aggressive retort.

In trusting relationships there is a space that allows team members to have robust conversations. This allows for disagreements and the sharing of multiple perspectives, which in turn leads to better decision making.

Both Bion (1961) and Scott Peck (1990) highlight the issue of false harmony by on the one hand being dependent on the leader and on the other faking teamliness.

### From compliance to commitment

Healthy robust discussion underpinned by trust allows the team to reach final decisions that have people's commitment due to the process by which those decisions have been made. The collective buy-in means that everyone is working in the same direction towards the same goals.

### From irresponsibility to being accountable for delivery

Once a collective decision is arrived at and the plan of action agreed the team has to take responsibility for delivering on the promise, and individual team members need to take accountability for those elements of the plan.

Given the high levels of trust and the collective capacity to have tough conversations, then each person and the team itself can be challenged on non-performance and there can also be focus on lessons learned.

### From varying and variable focus on other things to clear focus on results

Rather than just focusing on one's own goals, or one's own status, credibility, ego or ambition, the team needs to have a collective focus on the overall team goals, together with individual results.

When the team is accountable to each other for the delivery of the overall results, this allows them to stay focused on achieving the outcomes each of them set out to deliver.



The underpinning theory

Figure 2.1 Lencioni's five dimensions of a team

Focusing clearly on results

Taking accountability

Committing to decisions

Having robust conversations

Developing trust

SOURCE Adapted from Lencioni (2002)

#### THE FIVE DYSFUNCTIONS BETWEEN THE CHANGE AND PROJECT TEAMS

When the project team is focused on achieving the technical side of the change while the change team is focused on supporting people through change and embedding the change into the organization, potential conflicts can occur (Prosci 2003, 2018; Green 2007a). These typically can include:

e The two teams developing trust and effective teamworking within their respective teams but not trusting their colleagues in the other team.

e@ Developing an 'us and them' attitude with communications on a 'need to know' basis, affecting a phoney teamliness but not having the robust conversations necessary to understand the challenges that each team has and having a shared sense of the reality of the situation 'at the coalface'.

e As there are two teams, decisions made by one team do not necessarily have the buy-in from the other team despite a token acceptance of that decision.

e The project team, for example, might take accountability for technical aspects of the change (indeed that is their job), however they might not see that the

## Team change

corporate objective is embedding the change, so that people adopt the change and the benefits are realized. Similarly, the change team might focus too much on the people side and avoid accountability for when that gets in the way of progress on the technical side.

e Because the two teams will typically have quite different sets of objectives (the project team's clear milestones and metrics around time, quality and costs, and the change team's somewhat longer-term goals and a focus on people behaviours, and adoption and satisfaction rates) there can be quite a disconnect between the results that the project team and the change team are aiming for.

Clearly, energy spent addressing the potential dysfunctions before they happen, would be time and money well spent. Cross-team building, enabling communication strategies, working closely and collaboratively, sharing information, goals,

challenges and dilemmas, would all move the change forward more effectively.

XQ

## STOP AND THINK!

02.9 Imagine that you are one of a team of five GPs working at a local practice. You want to initiate some changes in the way the team approaches non-traditional medical methods such as counselling, homeopathy and osteopathy. The GPs meet monthly for one hour to discuss finances and review medical updates. They do not really know each other well or work together on patient care. There is no real team leader, although the Practice Manager takes the lead when the group discusses administration.

Using one of the models of team development described above, explain how you could lead the team towards a new way of working together. What obstacles to progress do you predict, and how might you deal with them?

## How individuals affect team dynamics

Here we use the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator™ to see how individual personalities might influence and be influenced by the team. We also use Meredith Belbin's (1981) research into team types to indicate what types of individuals best make up an effective team.

The underpinning theory

MBTI™ and teams

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator™ suggests that if you are a particular type you have particular preferences and are different from other people of different types (see Table 1.6 for MBTI™ types). This means that when it comes to change, people with different preferences react differently to change, both when they initiate it and when they are on the receiving end of it. This is also true when you are a member of a team. Different people will bring their individual preferences to the table and behave in differing ways.

‘Let’s just do it’ ‘Let’s change it’

## Team change

When undergoing team change, individual team members will typically react in one of four ways (see the four illustrations):

- e Some will want to ascertain the difference between what should be preserved and what could be changed. There will be things they want to keep.

- e Some will think long and hard about the changes that will emerge internally from their visions of the future. They will be intent on thinking about the changes differently.

- e Some will be keen to move things on by getting things to run more effectively and efficiently. They will be most interested in doing things now.

- e Some will be particularly inventive and want to try something different or novel. They will be all for changing things.

The use of MBTI™, or any other personality-profiling instrument, can have specific benefits when teams are experiencing or managing change. It can identify where individuals and the team itself might have strengths to be capitalized on, and where it might have weaknesses that need to be supported.

Behaviours exhibited by team members will run ‘true to type’, so knowing your preferences and those of the rest of the team will help aid understanding. It is also true that different team tasks might be suitable for different types — either because they are best matched or because it provides a development opportunity. Surfacing differences helps individuals see things from the other person’s perspective, and adds to the effective use of diversity within the team.

Researching in the health care industry, McCaulley (1975) made the point that similarity and difference within teams can have both advantages and disadvantages:

- e The more similar the team members are, the sooner they will reach common understanding.

- e The more disparate the team members, the longer it takes for understanding to occur.

- e The more similar the team members, the quicker the decision will be made, but the greater the possibility of error through exclusion of some possibilities.

- e The more disparate the team members, the longer the decision-making process will be, but the more views and opinions will be taken into account.

McCaulley also recognized that teams valuing different types can ultimately experience less conflict.

A particular case worth mentioning is the management team. Management teams

both in the United States and the United Kingdom are skewed from the natural distribution of Myers-Briggs types within the whole population. Typically they are composed of fewer people of the feeling types and fewer people of the perceiving

## The underpinning theory

types. This means that management teams, when making decisions about change, are more likely to put emphasis on the business case for change, and less likely to think or worry about the effect on people. You can see the result of this in most change programmes in most organizations. They are also more likely to want to close things down, having made a decision, rather than keep their options open — thus excluding the possibility of enhancing and improving on the changes or responding to feedback.

There are some simple reminders of the advantages and disadvantages of the preferences for teams making decisions about managing change within organizations listed in Table 2.5.

### Table 2.5 Complementarity and conflict in teams

Extroversion Where individuals Introversion

Needed to raise energy, show enthusiasm, make contacts and take action. — draw their energy from and depth of understanding.

But they can appear superficial, intrusive and overwhelming. But can appear withdrawn, cold and aloof.

Sensing What an individual Intuition

Needed to base ideas firmly in reality and be practical and pragmatic. — pays attention to or how he/she receives future and generate innovative data and information solutions.

Can appear rather mundane and pessimistic. Can appear to have head in the clouds, impractical and implausible.

Thinking How an individual Feeling

Needed to balance benefits against the costs and make tough decisions. — makes decisions and to reconcile. Needed to be in touch with emotional intelligence, to

Can appear rather critical and Can appear irrational and too

insensitive. emotional.

Judging What sort of lifestyle Perceiving

Needed for his/her organization an individual enjoys Needed for his/her flexibility,  
and ability to complete things adaptability and information  
and see them through. gathering.

Can appear overly rigid and Can appear rather unorganized

immovable. and somewhat irresponsible.

Belbin's team roles

What people characteristics need to be present for a team to function effectively?

Belbin (1981) has been researching this question for half a century. The purpose of his research was to see whether high and low performing teams had certain

## Team change

characteristics. He looked at team members and found that in the higher performing teams, members played a role or number of roles. Any teams without members playing one of these roles would be more likely to perform at a lower level of effectiveness. (Of course different situations require certain different emphases.) He identified the roles shown in Table 2.6, with their contributions and allowable weaknesses.

Belbin said that ‘the benefit of utilizing and understanding Team Roles is that not only do we learn more about ourselves, but also a lot about our work colleagues and how to get the best out of them’ (van Vliet, 2012).

### STOP AND THINK!

02.10 What team role(s) are you likely to use?

02.11 What are the advantages and disadvantages of each of the nine roles?

Q2.12 How might the different team roles help during the change process?

Belbin concluded that if teams were formed with individuals’ preferences and working styles in mind, they would have a better chance of team cohesion and work-related goal achievement. Teams need to contain a good spread of Belbin team types.

Different teams might need different combinations of roles. Marketing and design teams probably need more Plants, while project implementation teams need Implementers and Completer Finishers. Likewise, the lack of a particular team type can be an issue. A management team without a Co-ordinator or Shaper would have problems. An implementation team without a Complete Finisher might also struggle.

How well teams initiate and adapt to organizational change and build resilience

Throughout the last decades of the 20th century many organizations repeated the mantra, ‘people are our greatest asset’, and many would then apologize profusely when they were forced into downsizing or ‘rightsizing’ the workforce. Similarly, many organizations have sung the praises of teams and how essential they are within the modern organization. Many organizations have sets of competences or stated values that implicitly and explicitly pronounce that their employees need to work in the spirit of teamwork and partnership.

Table 2.6 Belbin team-role summary sheet

is

m

ua 2 2

### Team-Role Descriptions

Team Role | Contribution Allowable Weakness

Plant Creative, imaginative, Ignores incidentals. Too pre-  
yo unorthodox. Solves difficult occupied to communicate  
\* fe problems. effectively.

Resource Extrovert, enthusiastic, Over-optimisite. Loses  
Investigator | communicative. Explores interest once initial  
opportunities. Develops enthusiasm has passed.  
contacts.

Co-ordinator | Mature, confident, a good Can be seen as manipulative.  
~ chairperson. Clarifies goals, Offloads personal work.  
promotes decision-making,  
delegates well.

Shaper Challenging, dynamic, thrives Prone to provocation.  
on pressure. The drive and Offends people's feelings.  
courage to overcome obstacles.

Monitor Sober, strategic and discerning. Lacks drive and ability to  
Evaluator Sees all options. Judges inspire others.  
&> accurately.

Teamworker | Co-operative, mild, perceptive Indecisive in crunch  
and diplomatic. Listens, builds, situations.  
averts friction.

Implementer Disciplined, reliable, Somewhat inflexible. Slow to  
conservative and efficient. respond to new possibilities.  
Turns ideas into practical  
actions.

Completer Painstaking, conscientious, Inclined to worry unduly.  
Finisher anxious. Searches out errors Reluctant to delegate.  
and omissions. Delivers on  
time.

Specialist Single-minded, self-starting, Contributes on only a narrow  
~) dedicated. Provides knowledge front. Dwells on  
Oc and skills in rare supply. technicalities.

www.belbin.com © e-interlace, Belbin Associates, UK. 2001

This 'BELBIN® handout' is the property of Belbin Associates, UK and protected by copyright, database, trademark and other intellectual property rights. You must retain all copyright and other proprietary notices contained on this original and on any copy you make. You may not sell or modify this handout. The use of this handout on any other Website is prohibited. You agree not to adapt, tr modify, d ile, di: ible, or reverse engi the handout. 'BELBIN' is a registered

trademark of BELBIN ASSOCIATES, UK.

## Team change

It was therefore interesting for the authors to discover that there was a real lack of any authoritative research on the interplay between organizational change and team-working. We have seen the effect that change has on individuals and groups of individuals, but what has not been studied is the effect of change on teams. And as a consequence there is very little research on strategies for managing and leading teams through organizational change.

Whelan-Berry and Gordon (2000), in their research into effective organizational change, conducted a multi-level analysis of the organizational change process. To quote them:

They found no change process models at the group or team level of analysis in the organization studies and change literature. Literature exists which explores different aspects of team or group development, team or group effectiveness, implementation of specific interventions, and organizational and individual aspects of the change, but not a group/team change process model ... the lack of change process models for the team or group level change process in the context of organizational change leaves a major portion

of the organizational change process unclear.

They continue:

The primary focus of existing organizational change models is what to do as opposed to explaining or predicting the change process. Most of the models implicitly, and a few explicitly, acknowledge the inherent (sub) processes of group level and individual level change, but do not include the details of these processes in the model. The question

is how does the change process vary when considered across levels of analysis? For example, how does a vision get 'translated,' that is, take on meaning, in each location or department? In addition, what happens at the point of implementation? We must 'double click' at the point of implementation in the organizational level change process; that is, we must look at the group and individual levels and their respective change processes to understand the translation and implementation of the organizational-level change vision and desired change outcomes to group and subsequently to individual meanings,

frameworks, and behaviours.

Table 2.7 examines each type of team previously identified and looks at the way in which this type of team can impact or react to organizational change. We also look at the pros and cons of each team type when involved in an organizational change process.

Team development processes are disturbed in

times of change. An external event can shift a performing team back into the storming stage. Only teams that are quite remote from the

changes can simply incorporate a new scope or a new set of values and remain relatively untouched.

Teams going through change

(PE:

Group

Work

Parallel

Matrix

y to initiate

y to adapt to

es during

tages during

r leaders

ossible uses

ange

Dependent on nature and  
composition of group

Dependent on purpose  
and composition of group

Difficult to get alignment

Useful for coming up with  
out-of-the-box ideas

Good for initiating ideas  
and spreading the word

Can act as an  
organizational 'glue' to aid  
cohesion and create a  
holding environment  
during periods of  
instability

Can also provide a useful  
social function

Limited

Dependent on team members and team culture

Good at implementation once it is clear

Doesn't like change too often

Need to involve the leaders or shapers of these teams early — especially if you need their commitment rather than compliance

Building change objectives into team objectives can ensure focus on change as well as business as usual  
Can act as a two-way communications channel

Limited in terms of organizational impact

Dependent on purpose and team members

Good for pilot schemes

Can become alienated through failure, or through boasting about success

Useful for starting things up and proving an idea

Do not let them become too isolated

Encourage them to link with the outside world

Can be used to ensure vertical and horizontal communication

Can be used as cross-organization task force or project groups

Aids organizational communication

Fair, given prot address chang  
Dependent on enabling or dis structure

Flexible, so go initiating ideas  
Leadership so not clear, so di can go on for «

Good for initia and spreading

When one axis matrix structur changing the c can be used a: of stability

Can be used a cross-organiza communicatio

(Continued)

(PE: Virtual Network Management Project Change  
y to initiate Limited unless Potentially large Theoretically and Potentially high Raison d'être  
project specific depending on nature practically high depending on  
and composition of — Typically should be integration into  
group the team that organization  
initiates change  
ytoadapt Dependent on Dependent on Theoretically and Theoretically high Theoretically |  
purpose and team purpose and team practically high Good for limited practically hig  
members members Sometimes will have changes in scope but  
difficulty adapting to \_ not total  
others' change  
es during Brings disparate Wide reaching, so Powerful, so makes Good focus for Has increasec

tages during

groups together if  
tightly focused

Lack of cohesion  
means purpose may  
be misunderstood  
and important issues  
are not raised

good for sharing  
sense of purpose  
and sense of urgency

Not good for  
monitoring  
implementation  
because of lack of  
process and  
regularity

an impact

Often resistant to

changing through lack

of time or lack of  
teamwork, so role  
modelling of desired

changes can be weak  
Focus on events after

the launch often poor

due to packed  
agenda and belief  
that it will all happen  
smoothly

specific  
implementation  
goals

Not good for tackling  
complex topics such  
as values or  
leadership

Can focus too much  
on the technical side  
at the expense of the  
people side of  
change - 'the  
operation was a  
success but the  
patient died'

and sense of  
because it we  
to make chan

Not impactful  
influence (pre  
powerful peo  
Can ignore th  
business imp  
install change

(Continued)

(PE: Virtual Network Management Project Change

r leaders Involve the key virtual Good for initiating Do something Good for short-range Recruit powe  
teams early — ideas and spreading surprising yourself if tasks, such as to sponsor an

especially the leaders the word you want your appointing model  
and shapers, but management team consultants or Work on aligr  
don't expect them to to change the way it researching Ensure resou  
implement anything works techniques

complicated Insist on role Not good for the  
modelling complex stuff. Don't

Keep your eye on the be tempted to give a

ball because there complex issue like

WILL be problems 'improve

communication' to a

project team

ssible uses Can be used to Can be used as part Senior and middle Critical for the Critical for the  
ange ensure important of the change management teams technical aspects of aspects of thi

communication

messages get

reinforced

Can aid cohesion  
across geographies in  
times of change

initiatives to ensure  
communication and  
knowledge transfer,  
test out ideas,  
knowledge cafés,  
communities of  
practice, focused on  
the change

have a crucial role in  
sponsoring and  
communicating  
change, acting as an  
important conduit for  
two-way  
communication and  
as advocates for  
change

the change to be  
implemented in  
accordance with

time, cost and quality

to be implem:

to ensure effe

two-way

communicatic

address areas

potential resis

## Team change

## Team resilience

Carmeli et al (2013) define team resilience as the team's belief that 'it can absorb and cope with strain, as well as a team's capacity to cope, recover, and adjust positively to difficulties' while Alliger et al (2015) suggest that it's the team's capacity 'to withstand and overcome stressors in a manner that enables sustained performance; it helps teams handle and bounce back from challenges that can endanger their cohesiveness and performance'.

They continue by highlighting the fact that in times of change the team cohesion can fragment and individual team members focus on their needs and their goals with the consequential reduction in team effectiveness across the dimensions we have discussed. They suggest strategies at the beginning, during and end of any change process:

Minimize adverse factors before the change through:

- @ anticipating challenges and planning contingencies;
- e understanding current states of readiness for change;
- e identifying early warning signs; and
- ® preparing to handle any team stressors.

Manage adverse factors during the change through:

- e assessing challenges quickly and accurately;
- e addressing long-standing (chronic) stressors;
- e maintaining the team process under stress; and
- e seeking guidance from within and outside the team.

Mend adverse impacts after the change through:

- e regaining situational awareness;
- e conducting team debriefs;
- e addressing concerns and any points of risk; and
- ® expressing appreciation.

When you reflect upon these activities the key elements are the continuing focus both on the team process (knowing the why and the how) and on team relationships (within and outside of the team).

In order to build resilience within the team to address the above points it is worth

looking at Sharma and Sharma (2016) who have developed a team resilience scale that identifies 10 factors for focus and development:

## F100 | The underpinning theory

### Team mastery

- e Creating a learning team.
  - e Developing team flexibility regarding task accomplishment and innovation.
- ### Group structure
- e Effective allocation of work to meet team goals.
  - e Optimizing the team structure and size 'fit for purpose'.
  - e Setting operating norms and values.

### Social capital

- e Shared language ensuring free flow of information and sense making.
- e Development of trust across the team.
- e Attention to team relationships.

### Collective efficacy

- e Confidence in the competence of other team members to achieve their individual tasks,
- e Confidence in the competence of the team to achieve the team goals.

### Summary and conclusions

- e Groups and teams are different, with different characteristics and different reasons for existing.
- e Teams are important in organizational life for accomplishing large or complex tasks.
- e Teamwork is important for management teams when they work on risky issues that require them to share views and align.
- e There are many different types of organizational team, each with significant benefits and downsides.
- e Teams can become more effective by addressing five elements:
  - team mission, planning and goal setting;
  - team roles;
  - team operating processes;
  - team interpersonal relationships; and

— inter-team relations.

## Team change

e Teams develop over time. Tuckman's forming, storming, norming and performing model is useful for understanding this process.

e The team development process involves different leadership challenges at each stage.

e Bion's work highlights four possible pitfalls that need to be worked through:

- dependency;
- fight or flight;

pairing; and

- oneness.

e The composition of a team is an important factor in determining how it can be successful. Belbin says that well-rounded teams are best. Deficiencies in a certain role can cause problems.

e Lencioni highlights five dysfunctions of teams and the need to move them from:

- distrust to trust;

— conflict avoidance to willingness to engage in conflict and have robust conversations;

- compliance to commitment to decisions;

- irresponsibility to being individually and jointly accountable for delivery; and
- varying and variable focus on other things to clear focus on results.

e The Myers-Briggs profile allows mutual understanding of team members' preferences for initiating or adapting to change.

e Belbin's team roles offer a way of analysing a team's fitness for purpose and encouraging team members to do something about any significant gaps.

e Leaders need to be aware of the types of team available during a change process, and how to manage these most effectively.

e Preparing teams for change and sustaining them through change is a key component for ensuring team resilience. Allinger et al (2015) and Sharma and Sharma (2016) identify strategies for enabling team resilience.

Below is a summary checklist of the key questions you need to be asking and answering before, during and after the change process:

e Where are the teams affected by the change process?

e What types of team are they and how might they respond to change?

e What do they need to be supported through the change process?

e How can we best use them throughout the change process?

e What additional types of team do we need for designing and implementing the changes?

e As all teams go through the transition, what resources shall we offer to ensure they achieve their objectives of managing business as usual and the changes?

e How do we ensure that teams that are dispersing, forming, integrating or realigning stay on task?

e What organizational process do we have for ensuring teams are clear about their:

- mission, planning and goal setting;
- roles and responsibilities
- operating processes;
- interpersonal relationships; and
- inter-team relations?