A team is a special type of group in which people work interdependently to accomplish a goal. Organizations use many different types of teams to serve a variety of purposes. The use of teams to perform work has a long history, but during the past few decades organizational teamwork has changed: it has expanded rapidly due to changes in the characteristics of workers, the nature of jobs, and the structure of organizations. The scientific study of group dynamics provides useful insights about how teams operate and how they can be improved.

**Learning Objectives**

1. What are the characteristics of a group?
2. How is a team different from a group?
3. How are teams used by organizations?
4. How are traditional work groups different from traditional teams and self-managing teams?
5. Why is the use of teams by organizations increasing?
6. What are the main historical trends in the use of teams?
7. How has the study of group dynamics changed over time?
1.1 Defining Groups and Teams

A group is more than just a collection of people. There is a difference between the people who are in a park, the work group that is assembling a product, and the team playing football. Researchers have used several approaches to define the differences between collections of people, groups, and teams that vary as to which features are considered important.

One approach is to describe the social characteristics of a group (see Table 1.1). A group exists for a reason or purpose and has a goal shared by the group members. The people in a group have some type of relationship or are connected to one another. They recognize this connection, and it binds them together so they collectively share what happens to fellow group members. From a teamwork perspective, this interdependence is probably the most important characteristic of a group. Group members interact and communicate with one another. Often, communication is viewed as a central process of a group. The people in a group recognize and acknowledge their membership in the group.

TABLE 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of a Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in a collective. Formal and informal rules, roles, and norms of the group control the interactions of group members. The people in a group influence one another, and the desire to remain in the group increases the potential for mutual influence. Finally, a group satisfies members’ physical and psychological needs such that individuals are motivated to continue participation.

From a psychological perspective, two processes define a group: social identification and social representation (Hayes, 1997). Social identification refers to the recognition that a group exists separately from others. It is the creation of a belief in “us versus them.” Identification is both a cognitive process (classifying the world into categories) and an emotional process (viewing one’s group as better than other groups). Social representation is the shared values, ideas, and beliefs that people have about the world. Over time, belonging to a group changes the ways its members view the world. The group develops a shared worldview through member interactions.

Most definitions of teamwork classify a team as a special type of group. To some theorists, the distinction between groups and teams is fuzzy. They consider teams to be simply groups in work settings (Parks & Sanna, 1999). Other theorists focus on how the behavior of teams differs from that of typical groups. Teams have been defined as structured groups of people working on defined common goals that require coordinated interactions to accomplish certain tasks (Forsyth, 1999). This definition emphasizes one key feature of a team: that members work together on a common project for which they all are accountable. However, other qualifiers can be used to distinguish groups from teams.

One common distinction relates to application. Teams typically are engaged in sports or work activities. They have applied functions, and the roles of team members are related to their functions. For example, members of sports teams have specific assigned roles, such as pitcher or shortstop. Teams usually are parts of larger organizations. Their members have specialized knowledge, skills, and abilities related to their tasks. This is why we typically do not talk about a family as a team; in a family, roles are inherited and not directly related to tasks. This distinction appears in research on groups and teams. Research on groups typically is done in laboratory settings, whereas research on teams typically is done in field studies that focus on the use of teams in the workplace (Kerr & Tindale, 2004).

“Group” is a more inclusive term than “team.” Groups range in size from two to thousands, whereas teams have a narrower range of sizes. A dating couple may be considered a group but not a team. Political parties and social organizations are groups but not teams. A team typically is composed of 4 to 20 people who interact with one another directly (although this interaction may occur through computers and other communication devices). A team is not simply people who belong to the same group or who are coacting in the same place.
Katzenbach and Smith (1993) focus on performance in their definition of teamwork. According to these authors, in addition to team members having a common purpose, performance goals are connected to this purpose, for which everyone in the team is held mutually accountable. They also believe the concept of a team should be limited to a fairly small number of people with complementary skills who interact directly. This helps to distinguish teams from work groups, whose members jointly do the same tasks but do not require integration and coordination to perform the tasks.

Hayes (1997) focuses on power in her definition of teams. She believes a team must actively cooperate to achieve its goals. For this to occur, a team must have independence, responsibility, and the power to operate. A team is not a group of people who perform a task under the rigid control of an authority figure. For a group to become a team, it must be empowered and must have some authority to act on its own. In addition, team members are more likely to work together cooperatively and provide assistance to one another than are members of other types of work groups.

Because there is no firm dividing line between a group and a team, the use of these terms in this book is somewhat arbitrary. When referring to research on group dynamics, especially laboratory research, the term “group” is used. When talking about applications in work environments where people are interdependent, the term “team” is used. For the in-between cases, “group” and “team” are used interchangeably.

### 1.2 Purposes and Types of Teams

Organizations use teams in a variety of ways. Because of this variety, there are many ways of classifying teams. These classifications help to explain the psychological and organizational differences among different types of teams. One important distinction is the relationship of the team to the organization. Teams vary depending on how much power and authority they are given by organizations.

#### How Teams Are Used by Organizations

Teams are used to serve a variety of functions for organizations. The day-to-day operations of organizations can be shifted to teams (e.g., factory production teams, airline crews). Teams can be formed to provide advice and deal with special problems. For instance, teams might be created to suggest improvements in work processes. Teams help to manage coordination problems by linking different parts of organizations. Budget or planning committees might be composed of members from several departments, for
example. Finally, teams can be used to change organizations by planning for the future or managing transitions.

Obviously, teams may come in mixed packages. Concurrent engineering teams are teams composed of members of an organization whose task is to oversee the design, manufacturing, and marketing of new products. Being in a concurrent engineering team is part of the day-to-day activity of people working in research and development. However, other members of the team are there on a part-time, temporary basis to deal with coordination, special problems, and implementation of change. Research and development staff may define the characteristics of a new product, while representatives from other departments may comment on issues related to production and marketing.

Sundstrom (1999) identifies six types of work teams on the basis of the functions they perform:

1. Production teams, such as factory teams, manufacture or assemble products on a repetitive basis.
2. Service teams, such as maintenance crews and food services, conduct repeated transactions with customers.
3. Management teams, composed of managers, work together, plan, develop policy, or coordinate the activities of an organization.
4. Project teams, such as research and engineering teams, bring experts together to perform a specific task within a defined period.
5. Action or performing teams, such as sports teams, entertainment groups, and surgery teams, engage in brief performances that are repeated under new conditions and that require specialized skills and extensive training or preparation.
6. Parallel teams are temporary teams that operate outside normal work, such as employee involvement groups and advisory committees that provide suggestions or recommendations for changing an organization.

Classifying Teams

Teams can be classified by ways other than the types of activities they perform, but there is no agreed-on classification system for work teams (Devine, Clayton, Philips, Dunford, & Melner, 1999). Researchers have suggested classifying teams by whether they are permanent or temporary, how much internal specialization and interdependence they require, and how much integration and coordination with other parts of the organization are needed.
One of the most important distinctions among types of teams is how much power they are allocated (Hayes, 1997). When an organization uses teams rather than individual workers to perform tasks, it is giving the teams some power and authority to control the operations of its members. This shifting of power affects leadership, decision making, and how team members’ work activities are linked.

There are three options for organizing people into work groups: a traditional work group, a traditional team, or a self-managing team. The differences among these options are presented in Table 1.2. Traditional work groups are part of the organization’s hierarchical system. Supervisors or managers who control the decision-making process lead these work groups. Group members typically work on independent tasks that are linked by the supervisors or work system.

Traditional teams are given some power and authority, so they are somewhat independent of the organization’s hierarchy. Their leaders are selected by management and given some managerial power. Team leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization of People Into Work Groups</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional Work Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities or Tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

can use a variety of techniques for making decisions, such as using the teams to provide advice about decisions (consultative) and having the teams vote to make decisions. Team members’ work activities are interdependent and coordinated by the leaders.

Self-managing teams are given significantly more power and authority than traditional work groups, and are more independent of an organization’s hierarchy. Team members typically select their leaders, so the leaders have limited power and must facilitate—rather than control—their teams’ operations. The leaders must rely on democratic or consensus decision making because they have no authority to make teams accept decisions. The work of team members is highly interdependent, and all team members work together to coordinate activities.

### 1.3 Why Organizations Use Teams

The traditional approach to organizing people to perform a task is called “scientific management” (Taylor, 1923). In this approach, managers or technical experts analyze a task and divide it into small activity units that are performed by individuals. The system is designed such that each activity unit is linked to other activity units, and individuals work separately to complete the entire task. It is the role of management to design the system and control the operations of the workers. It is the role of the workers to perform a specific activity. In other words, managers think and control, and workers act.

This traditional approach works very well under certain conditions. It requires that the task remain the same for some time because it is difficult to change the system. It requires that the process be not too complex or easily disrupted because the workers doing routine activities are unaware of what happens in other parts of the system. It focuses on productivity and often ignores concerns about quality and customer service because these factors require more commitment to the job. It assumes that there are workers who are willing to perform routine activities under controlled situations because that is the nature of the work. Under these conditions, scientific management is the best approach, and the time and expense of developing teams is not needed.

Teams are important, however, when the goal is to improve the way a product is made or a service is provided, when the job is complex, when customer service and quality are important, or when rapid change is necessary. These are the conditions that create the need for teams. Because team members have more autonomy and are developing new skills, teams encourage commitment from people who want more from work than just money.
Modern organizations are shifting to teamwork because of changes in the characteristics of workers, jobs, and organizations.

**Characteristics of Workers**

Scientific management operates under a negative set of assumptions about workers, called “Theory X” (McGregor, 1960). Theory X managers assume that people are basically lazy, do not like to work, want to avoid responsibility, and need coercion to be motivated. Given these assumptions, a command-and-control organizational system makes sense. These assumptions are not valid, however, for the most desirable workers.

An alternative set of managerial assumptions, called “Theory Y,” is based on the belief that work is a natural activity for people, that people want responsibility, and that there are a variety of ways to motivate people. Theory Y focuses on gaining commitment to the task and getting people to accept responsibility for their work. The goal of this approach is to design a job that people will want to perform, rather than trying to force people to perform a job they dislike.

The shift to a commitment-based organization based on employee responsibility, autonomy, and empowerment is one of the core notions of teamwork. This transition helps to improve the quality of people’s jobs, increase internal motivation, and improve job satisfaction (Orpen, 1979). For many people, autonomy and responsibility are the most important considerations in evaluating a job (Finegan, 1993). Often, the best way to create or enhance job satisfaction in an organization is to shift from scientific management to teamwork.

**Job Characteristics**

Many jobs are changing from routine to nonroutine work (Mohrman, Cohen, & Mohrman, 1995), which encourages the use of teamwork. Nonroutine jobs involve more complexity, interdependence, uncertainty, variety, and change than do routine jobs. Jobs of this type are difficult to manage in traditional work systems, but are well suited for teamwork.

Nonroutine jobs are found in a number of contemporary work settings. Teams are a good way to handle factory jobs that have become increasingly complex due to technology or other factors (Manufacturing Studies Board, 1986). In modern computer-oriented factories, the typical worker operating a single machine all day is being replaced by a team of workers who monitor, troubleshoot, maintain, and manage a complex and integrated work system. Because the technology is integrated, the workers must be as well.
These changes also affect professional work. Imagine designing a new product for the marketplace. Design, manufacturing, marketing, and sales of the product require expertise from a variety of disciplines and support from many parts of an organization. Given that few individuals possess all the necessary knowledge and expertise to bring a product to completion, a diversity of knowledge is gained by using a team approach. In addition, using team members from several departments enhances support within the organization for the new product. The team members help coordinate the project throughout the organization.

The complexity of a problem or task often requires multiple forms of expertise. No one person may have all the skills or knowledge to complete a task or solve a problem, but a team may have sufficient expertise to deal with the task or problem. Complexity also implies problems that are confusing or difficult to understand and solve. Here, the value of teamwork is not in multiple forms of expertise but rather in multiple perspectives. People learn from the group interactions in teams, which helps them to gain new perspectives in analyzing problems and developing solutions.

As jobs become more interdependent, it becomes increasingly difficult for managers to control the flow of information. Everyone needs to be aware of changes that affect his or her job and to coordinate with others in dealing with these changes. Teams become necessary to promote coordination in a rapidly changing organizational environment.

Work is becoming more varied. Increasingly, complex technical systems do not require routine operation, but do require monitoring and troubleshooting. Changes in technology and markets require flexibility to meet new demands. Teams provide a mechanism for creating jobs that are more responsive to the changing work environment.

Organizational Characteristics

The rate of change in technology and other aspects of business is continually increasing. Markets are expanding, and competition is progressively more global. It is difficult to keep up with these changes using traditional approaches to organizational design; the changing business environment is forcing organizations to change the way they operate. Communications technology allows organizations to create new ways to integrate their operations. Businesses know they need to reduce costs, improve quality, reduce the time spent creating new products, improve customer service, and increase their adaptability to an increasingly competitive environment.

As organizations change to meet contemporary demands, new organizational characteristics increase the importance of teamwork (Mohrman et al.,
1995). One significant new characteristic is a shift to simpler organizational hierarchies, a transition being driven by the desire to save costs and increase flexibility by reducing layers of management. To a certain extent, teams have replaced managers, and teams now often carry out traditional management functions.

Teams provide a way to integrate and coordinate the various parts of an organization. They can do this in a more timely and cost-effective manner than can traditional organizational hierarchies. Teams execute tasks better, learn faster, and change more easily than do traditional work structures, which are all characteristics required by contemporary organizations.

Although teamwork in organizations has expanded dramatically, teams have not been universally successful. Teamwork has become a management fad with its own set of problems. Organizations sometimes introduce teams in situations where they may be inappropriate. Managers may implement teams without changing the organizational contexts or supplying sufficient resources or training. Organizations sometimes call groups of employees “teams” without really changing the nature of work or the organizational reward systems.

1.4 History of Teams and Group Dynamics

The use of teams in organizations has changed significantly over the past century. During that period, the scientific study of group dynamics has become an interdisciplinary research field.

Foundations of Teamwork

Historically, there have been two major ways of organizing people for work. One approach uses a structured hierarchy and is based on the model established by the military. Command and control is the dominant theme: everyone has a single job and a single boss, and everyone’s primary activity is to do what he or she is told. The alternative is a small group or family approach, which is the model for traditional farming and the manufacturing guild system. Here, the organization is fairly small, commitment is often for life, people work their way up through the system as they learn new skills, and work is a collective activity.

The Industrial Revolution of the early 1900s shifted most work organizations to the hierarchical approach and used scientific management to design organizations and jobs (Taylor, 1923). Jobs were simplified, so the advantages to skilled workers created by the guild system were minimized.
Professionals, from accountants to engineers, were brought in to the hierarchy to make sure the production system operated efficiently. Scientific management was a system that worked well, but that also created problems: It alienated workers, who then became increasingly difficult to motivate. It became more difficult to set up as technical systems increased in complexity. It was inflexible and difficult to change. Finally, it was difficult to successfully incorporate new goals (such as quality) other than efficiency.

The scientific management model of organizations began to be questioned during the 1920s and 1930s. The rise of unions and other worker organizations demonstrated that there were problems with people’s relationship to work. This led to an increased interest in the social aspects of work and the development of the Human Relations Movement.

The Hawthorne studies—research projects designed to examine how environmental factors such as lighting and work breaks affected work performance—inadvertently raised questions about whether social relations in work could be ignored (Mayo, 1933). The studies revealed that social factors had an important impact on performance. In some cases, because people were being studied, they tried to perform better (what social scientists now call “the Hawthorne Effect”). In other cases, group norms limited or controlled performance. For example, studies of the “bank wiring room” showed that informal group norms had a major impact on the performance of work groups (Sundstrom, McIntyre, Halfhill, & Richards, 2000). The “group in front” frequently engaged in conversation and play but had high levels of performance, while the “group in back” engaged in play but had low levels of performance. The work groups enforced group production norms: members who worked too fast were hit on the arm by coworkers, a practice known as “binging.” In addition to the substantial impact on productivity of these informal work group norms, work groups were able to effectively enforce norms, with positive or negative benefits to the organization.

Following World War II, researchers in the United States and Europe who studied the standard approach to work recognized that although the military looked like a hierarchical system, the troops actually operated using teamwork. Research showed that organizing people in teams was one way to improve operations of organizations and improve productivity.

During the 1960s and 1970s, organizational psychologists and industrial engineers refined the use of teams at work. Sociotechnical systems theory (STS) provided a way to analyze what people do at work and to determine the best way of organizing them (Appelbaum & Batt, 1994). According to STS, teams should be used when jobs are technically uncertain rather than routine, when jobs are interdependent and require coordination to perform, and when the environment is turbulent and requires flexibility. Many jobs today meet these criteria.
The most famous applied example of STS was at the Volvo car facilities in Sweden. The assembly line approach to work was redesigned to be performed by semiautonomous groups. During the 1970s, this approach became part of the Quality of Worklife Movement in the United States. Although there were several successful demonstrations in Sweden and the United States of the value of using teams at work, this teamwork approach did not become popular.

The contemporary emphasis on teamwork has its origins in another change that occurred during the 1970s. The rise of Japan as a manufacturing power resulted in the distribution of high-quality inexpensive products in the global marketplace. This caused companies in the industrialized world to change their operating methods to reduce costs while increasing quality. When business experts visited Japan to see how Japanese goals had been achieved, they found that teamwork in the form of Quality Circles seemed to be the answer. Quality Circles are parallel teams of production workers and supervisors who meet to analyze problems and develop solutions to quality problems in the manufacturing process.

Throughout the 1980s, companies in the United States and Europe experimented with Quality Circle teams (and later Total Quality Management). The jobs performed by workers were still primarily individual, but workers were organized in teams as a way to improve quality and other aspects of production. These early efforts were primarily attempts to copy the Japanese approach. They met with mixed success, in part because of cultural differences. By the late 1980s, new approaches had been developed, and the concept of teamwork was spreading in organizations.

This focus on quality in manufacturing launched the current emphasis on teams, but other factors have sustained it. The increased use of information technology, the downsizing of layers of management, business process reengineering, and globalization have all contributed to the use of teams. Teamwork in U.S. companies expanded rapidly during the 1990s and included more professional and managerial teams. Current studies suggest that 85% of companies with 100 or more employees use some type of work teams (Cohen & Bailey, 1997). In addition, some organizations are restructuring and using teams as a central element in the integration of various parts of their organizations (Mohrman et al., 1995).

Foundations of Group Dynamics

An unfortunate gap exists between our understanding of work teams and the study of group dynamics. The scientific study of groups began at the turn of the 20th century with the work of Norman Triplett (Triplett, 1898). Triplett’s research showed the effects of working alone versus
working in a group. For example, he observed that bicycle racers who pedaled around a racetrack in groups were faster than those who pedaled around alone. This effect has been called “social facilitation” because the presence of other people facilitates (or increases) performance. (Later research showed that performance increased for well-learned skills but declined for less-well-developed skills.)

Early studies in psychology had a similar perspective in that they were designed to show how groups affected individual performance or attitudes. Although this was group research, the focus was on individuals. Psychologists did not treat groups as an entity appropriate for scientific study. This perspective changed during the 1940s, however, because of the work of Kurt Lewin and his followers (Lewin, 1951). Lewin created the term “group dynamics” to show his interest in the group as a unit of study. For the first time, psychologists took the study of groups seriously, rather than simply looking at the effects of groups on individuals. The initial work on how groups operate created a new research paradigm in psychology and the social sciences. Lewin’s innovations in research methods, applications, and focus still define much of the study of group dynamics today.

Lewin developed a new approach to research in psychology. He began with a belief that “There is nothing so practical as a good theory” (Lewin, 1951, p. 169). His innovation was in refining how theories in psychology should be used. He developed an approach called “action research,” in which scientists develop theories about how groups operate, and then use their theories in practical applications to improve the operations of groups. The process of applying a theory and evaluating its effects would be used to refine the theory and improve the operations of groups.

One of Lewin’s primary concerns was social change. He believed it is easier to change a group than it is to change an individual. If the behavior of individuals is changed and the individuals return to their everyday life, the influence of the people around them will tend to reverse the behavior change. If the behavior of a group of people is changed, the group will continue to reinforce or stabilize the behavioral change in its members. Lewin developed models of organizational change and group dynamics techniques that are still used today.

Although Lewin’s followers continued to conduct group research, mainstream social psychologists returned to their focus on theory-oriented laboratory studies during the 1950s and 1960s. Their research primarily examined topics such as conformity and helping behavior, which focused on the effects groups have on individuals, rather than on group dynamics. Research on group dynamics shifted to sociologists such as Robert Bales,
who used the study of small groups as a way to understand social systems. Their research used laboratory groups and led to the development of various systems for categorizing the group process, such as Interaction Process Analysis. This work showed the task versus social aspects of group behaviors and the role of leadership in groups.

During this period, organizational and Humanistic psychology researchers studied a special type of laboratory group called “t-groups” (also called “sensitivity groups” and “encounter groups”). These were small, unstructured groups that were encouraged to engage in open and personal discussions, often over a series of days. Participation in these groups was supposed to increase self-awareness, interpersonal communication skills, and group process skills. Their popularity decreased by the 1970s as concerns with ethics and transfer of training issues raised questions about their value. (See Chapter 17 for a further discussion of these issues.)

Contemporary research on group dynamics has grown beyond the field of psychology, and has become more interdisciplinary. Researchers from sociology, anthropology, political science, communication, business, and education now study aspects of groups. Although psychological research is still dominated by laboratory research on how groups operate, many other disciplines emphasize applied research and study groups in real-world settings. Currently, the study of group dynamics is an accepted academic discipline in a number of fields. As a theoretical area of study, it is fairly stable rather than growing. However, it is growing as an applied field as more organizations become interested in using groups and teams.

**Summary**

Groups are more than just collections of people. Groups have goals, interdependent relationships, interactions, structured relations, and mutual influence. Individuals are aware of their membership in groups and participate in order to satisfy personal needs. Although the distinction between groups and teams is not completely clear, the term “teamwork” typically is used to describe groups that are parts of sports or work organizations. Team members work interdependently to accomplish goals and have the power to control at least part of their operations.

Organizations are shifting away from individual work performed in hierarchical work structures and toward team-based operations. Changing goals in organizations, which must deal with the evolving work environment, are driving this change. People are demanding meaningful work, jobs are becoming increasingly complex and interdependent, and organizations are
finding that they must be more flexible. All these changes encourage the use of teamwork.

Organizations use teams in a number of ways. Teams provide advice, make things or provide services, create projects, and perform specialized activities. Teams also vary according to the power they are given, their types of leadership and decision-making processes, and the tasks they perform. These factors define the differences among traditional work groups, traditional teams, and self-managing teams.

Working in small groups was common before the Industrial Revolution, but scientific management simplified jobs and created hierarchical work systems. The Hawthorne studies of the 1930s demonstrated the importance of understanding the aspects of work related to social relations. Following World War II, researchers began to experiment with work teams. STS during the 1960s presented a way to analyze work and identify the need for teams. However, it was the rise of Japanese manufacturing teams during the 1980s that led to the increased use of teamwork in the United States. Paralleling this growth in the use of teams, the social sciences developed the field of group dynamics, which focuses on understanding how groups operate. Today, group dynamics is a scientific field that provides information useful in improving the operations of teams.

Team Leader’s Challenge 1

You have just become the manager of an insurance office with five professional agents and several clerical assistants. The office is part of a larger company headquartered in another city. Your office handles both sales and the processing of insurance claims. The office has been traditionally organized, with the manager running the office and supervising each employee individually.

You have heard a lot about the advantages of shifting to teamwork—it is popular in the business press. Shifting to teamwork is supposed to improve customer service, make the office more responsive to changes, and improve morale. However, you have also heard that it can be difficult to create and manage teams. You are comfortable and capable as a traditional manager, but think maybe you should try something new, like teamwork.

Should you (the office manager) try to reorganize the office into a team?

Should the team include both the professionals and the clerical assistants?

How much authority or control should you maintain over the team?
ACTIVITY: UNDERSTANDING GROUPS Versus TEAMS

Objective: There is no clear distinction between groups and teams. The purpose of this activity is to examine the implicit definitions that people have of these terms.

Activity: Create a list of groups and teams. Using Activity Worksheet 1.1, classify these examples as groups, teams, or somewhere in between the two. Compare your classifications with those of other members in your group. Try to reach agreement on the classifications by discussing how you decided.

ACTIVITY WORKSHEET 1.1

Groups Versus Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>In-Between Groups and Teams</th>
<th>Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis: When your group has reached agreement, analyze the lists and develop rules to define when a group becomes a team:

1. ____________________________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________________________

Discussion: Imagine that you are working in an office and your manager decides to organize the employees into a team. Using the rules you have developed to define a team, what advice would you give to the manager about how to create a team?