

Teamwork and Military Leadership

Prepared for: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute

**Prepared by:
Maria Nadjiwon-Foster
Sonya Smithers
Holly Livingstone**

Ref # 49251

Date: March 27, 2002

© HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF CANADA (2002)
as represented by the Minister of National Defence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Part 1: TEAMWORK</u>	1
Introduction	1
Definition of Teamwork	1
Groups versus Teams	2
History and Theory of Teamwork	2
Broad Factors	6
Context	6
Culture	6
Climate	6
Training	7
Feedback/Reward Systems	8
Structural Factors	10
Task/Team Design	10
Design of work	11
Design of team	12
Task Relevant Expertise	12
Group Size	12
Interpersonal Skills	13
Diversity in Teams	13
Individual Differences	14
Personality	14
Ability	15

Degree of Interdependence	15
Team Member Selection	15
Process Factors	16
Boundary Management	16
Cohesion	17
Performance Norms	18
Communication	18
Potency	18
Contingency Factors	18
Resource Availability/Management Support	19
Task Characteristics	19
Goals in Teamwork	19
Performance Issues	20
Team Learning	22
Conflict in Teams	22
Virtual Teams	23
Cross Functional Teams	24
Self-Managing Work Teams (SMWT)	25
Definition	25
History of SMWT	25
Benefits of SMWT	26
Costs and Risks of SMWT	26
SMWT Evaluation	27

Success of SMWT	28
Team Development	28
<u>Part 2 TEAM LEADERSHIP</u>	29
Types of Leaders	30
Transformational Leadership	30
Transactional Leadership	32
Transformational versus Transactional Leadership	33
Charismatic Leadership	34
Situational Leadership	35
Laissez-Faire Leadership	35
Leader-Member Exchange	36
Contextual Factors	36
Team Leadership	39
Leadership Systems	39
Team Leader Theory	40
Effective versus Average Performing Teams	42
Team Leadership and SMWT	44
Feedback and Team Leadership	45
<u>Part 3: RECOMMENDATIONS AND OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS</u>	46
Recommendation 1: Examination of team environment	46
Recommendation 2: Feedback/rewards analysis	46
Recommendation 3: Analysis of structural factors	47
Recommendation 4: Analysis of task/team design factors	48

Recommendation 5: Group cohesiveness	48
Recommendation 6: Goals	49
Recommendation 7: Performance management	49
Recommendation 8: Conflict	49
Recommendation 9: Cross-functional teams	49
Recommendation 10: Self-managing work teams	50
Recommendation 11: Transformational leadership and team effectiveness	50
Outstanding Questions	51
REFERENCES	52

PART 1: TEAMWORK

Introduction

In many popular outlets today, we are hearing of a call for an organizational restructuring around teams, particularly teams that are fluid, multifunctional and with less structure and boundaries. This redesign of organizational systems to focus more on teamwork is due in part to a decrease in the levels of management while decreasing the spans of control in the organization. There has also been the need to distribute the decision making responsibilities and to give more autonomy to the employees, and this need can only be expected to grow in the future (Stout, Salas, & Fowlkes, 1997). This is particularly relevant in the military as there is the need to control large dynamic systems such as emergency coordination and large organizations in such environments as combat information centres. It is also this ability of individuals to coordinate their actions in order to perform effectively as teams that has become a prerequisite for many civilian and military jobs.

A variety of definitions for teamwork have been proposed, but for the purpose of this research review, the definition by Blickensderfer, Cannon-Bowers and Salas (1997) is the most comprehensive. Teamwork is defined as “a distinguishable set of two or more people who interact dynamically, interdependently and adaptively toward a common goal” (p. 250). Most teams are also defined by a dynamic exchange of information and resources among team members, interdependence among team members, coordination of task activities, adjustments to task demands, and some organizational structuring. Levy and Steelman (1997) expand on the definition of teamwork and state that each member should have at least some specific role or function to perform. This necessity for each

member to contribute has definite implications on factors such as effectiveness and satisfaction that will be discussed later.

One important question is how to distinguish a “team” from a “work group” in the literature. Work groups are similar to teams in that they are made up of individuals who see themselves and are seen by others as a social entity (Guzzo & Dickson, 1996). In addition, both are interdependent groups of workers who are embedded in one or more larger social systems, and who perform tasks that affect others. However, while all teams are groups, not all groups can be considered teams (Avolio, Jung, Murry, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). For a group to be considered a team, the minimal requirement is that the group share a common goal. This includes a commitment to common purpose, a set of performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). Katzenbach and Smith also assert that groups become teams when they develop a sense of shared commitment and strive for synergy among members.

History and Theory of Teamwork

There are several different theoretical approaches for examining the links between teamwork and critical variables, processes, and factors that influence work team effectiveness (see Morgeson, Aiman-Smith, & Campion, 1997 for a review). Two major areas of literature from which these theories are derived are organizational behaviour and organizational development. Organizational behaviour (OB) is concerned with the behaviour of individuals and groups in formal organizations while organizational development (OD) is a collection of theories, values and techniques for bringing planned change to organizations.

Looking first at OB theory, Hackman and Morris (1975) present a model of work group effectiveness that is one of the most complete and influential. Hackman and Morris adapt an input-process-output model from McGrath (1964), and suggest that the group interaction process mediate the influence of three specific variables on group effectiveness. Interaction process refers to “all observable interpersonal behaviour that occurs between two arbitrary points in time” (p. 49). These three variables include individual-level (e.g., member knowledge, skill and abilities, as well as attitudes and personality characteristics), group-level (e.g., structure, level of cohesiveness and group size), and organizational-level variables (e.g., task characteristics, reward structures and environmental stress). Hackman and Morris outlined three “summary” variables in order to understand how input and process factors influence group outcomes which are member effort, task performance strategies and group member knowledge and skills. Also addressed in this theory is how the aspects of the task will dictate the extent to which the summary variables are important to the performance of the task. For example, more complicated tasks may depend more on knowledge and skill and less on member effort.

The next OB theory with implications for team theory research is that by Kolodny and Kiggundu (1980). They propose six factors as being related to work team effectiveness. First, organizational arrangements involve the structure of work, such as shifts, scheduling and machinery utilization, within a production phase. Next is technical skills that refer to general employee skill and competence to carry out technical tasks. Third, task conditions refer to the degree of task environment variability and uncertainty due to physical and atmospheric conditions. Fourth is group interaction which refers to interaction within work teams as well as the interaction between the team and other

organizational units. Next are group characteristics that concern the demographic and social backgrounds of the members of the group, as well as their previous and task-specific work experience. The last factor is leadership, and refers to the formal and informal forms of influence. These forms of influence include technical and social skills of group leadership, the relationship of the leader to the larger organization, and the quality of leadership within and across organizational units. In this model, these factors also interact with one another and have distinct influences on group performance.

A different approach to work team effectiveness was proposed by Shea and Guzzo (1987). They focused on human resource management issues, and in doing so, they abandoned the input-process-output model that is prevalent in the team effectiveness literature. They suggest that three factors interact to influence group effectiveness. First is *task interdependence* that refers to the degree of “task-driven interaction among group members” (p. 331). Task interdependence influences group effectiveness by moderating the relationship between the second factor of *outcome interdependence* (consequences shared by group members such as pay, which in turn depend on the extent to which the group reaches their goal) and group effectiveness as well as through its effect on the third factor of *potency* (the collective belief by the group that it will be effective). These factors are influenced, although indirectly, by the external organizational environment.

OD theories can be viewed as being composed to two general types, change process and implementation (Porras & Robertson, 1987, 1992). One change process theory has been proposed by Cartwright (1951), who draws from group dynamic theory in discussing how to produce individual change. It is suggested that many individual behaviours, attitudes, beliefs, and values are influenced or governed by an individual’s

team membership. As such, team-focused interventions are required for change. As well, teams can be used as the target or medium of change, so that teams exert certain pressures that influence individual behaviour. Or, teams are the target of change such that by changing certain aspects of the team (e.g., leadership, standards), individual behaviour is changed.

The last theory that drives the research on team work is that by Blake and Mouton (1968) who developed a comprehensive implementation model of organizational development, a key component of which is the leadership grid. This assessment tool identifies managerial style which is then compared with organizational problems and needs. These researchers suggest that problems with communication and planning are the two fundamental barriers to corporate excellence. Problems with supervision and underutilization of workers are the cause of these communication difficulties, and they suggest behaviour therapy in addressing these problems. On the other hand, a lack of business strategy can result in the noted planning difficulties. These problems form the basis of their model of OD and the specific phases of organizational change. The first three phases of their model attempt to address communication problems, and the next two focus on planning issues, with the final phase focusing on evaluation.

To further understand the theories surrounding the proposed links between teamwork and effectiveness, a more in depth discussion of the broad factors that have been deemed as important for team effectiveness must be discussed. These broad factors include contextual variables, structural factors, team/task design factors, process factors and contingency factors.

Broad Factors

Contextual Factors

Contextual factors are part of the work environment that are often amenable to change by the organization. They typically influence the effectiveness of the work team by creating an environment that is conducive to the effort of the team. Examples of these factors include culture, climate, training, and feedback/reward systems.

Culture in an organization refers to collective values and norms (Rousseau & Cooke, 1988). Organizations that favor innovation or incorporate shared expectations of success may be those that foster team effectiveness. Philosophies of top managers that value such things as superior quality or service, attention to detail and support of innovation report success in applying work teams (Galagan, 1986).

Organizational *climate* is a part of the organizational context, and the success of employee involvement factors, such as teamwork are contingent on this organizational context. Wallach (1983) defines supporting climates as those incorporating values such as harmony, openness, friendship, collaboration, encouragement, sociability, personal freedom and trust. Shadur, Kienzle and Rodwell (1999) proposes that it is likely that a supportive climate will enhance teamwork by creating an atmosphere of cooperation and openness. Another organizational climate variable that has been examined, in a limited fashion, is that of bureaucracy (Shadur et al., 1999). Bureaucratic organizations tend to adhere to vertical hierarchies, formalized communication mechanisms, and strict procedures. Organizations with this type of climate have clear lines of authority and responsibility that are based on control and power, and this affects work organization and employee attitudes (Shadur et al., 1999). Although research in this area is limited,

Shadur et al. (1999) found that bureaucratic climate did not predict the level or effectiveness of teamwork in the organization.

Training and consultation on team tasks are also resources that are considered in most models of team effectiveness (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993). Training content often includes team philosophy, group decision making, interpersonal skills and technical training. Cross-training is also an approach taken in production groups, and provides incentives for learning new skills in teams whose members can rotate jobs (Poza & Markus, 1980). According to Cannon-Bowers, Tannenbaum, Salas and Volpe (1995), each of the competencies or knowledge, skills and abilities needed in for team performance suggest different instructional strategies depending on the context. For example, in aviation cockpits, team members may repeat certain missions over time, however, they may be required to work with different crew members while performing this same mission. This training is referred to as task contingent training, and critical to this type of team situation are leadership, feedback and performance monitoring, assertiveness, planning, communication and situational awareness. Cannon-Bowers et al. (1995) also outline several propositions regarding which instructional strategies would be the most appropriate for different task-contingent competencies.

Training needs, however, may be different in knowledge-based settings (Hall & Beyerlin, 2000). Workers in these settings have a great deal of training in an area of expertise making communication difficult between members, and may force workers to seek outside consultation with others outside of the organization (Resnick-West & Von Glinow, 1990). Thus, management must develop training systems which help knowledge

workers communicate with one another and to help them seek assistance from other qualified professionals.

Feedback structure and *reward* systems, known as outcome interdependence, are also contextual factors that have an impact on the effectiveness of work teams.

According to Guzzo and Shea (1992), individual feedback and rewards should be linked to the group's performance in order to motivate group-oriented behaviour. Although most research on this topic focuses on feedback and rewards at the individual level, interdependent feedback and rewards have been found to be related to employee satisfaction in work groups (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993).

As a renowned aspect of training, feedback has a rich potential as a strategy to foster accurate shared mental models among members (Levy & Steelman, 1997). Feedback involves monitoring the performance of team members and giving, receiving and seeking job performance feedback. Levy and Steelman (1997) stress that it is important to consider the social context in which day-to-day feedback occurs, also known as the feedback environment. This is the social context surrounding the transmission and receipt of feedback on a daily basis. A favourable feedback environment is one in which performance feedback is constructive, (i.e., both positive and negative), specific, accurate and readily available. Practitioners agree that team effectiveness depends on accurate, timely feedback on performance (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990). In terms of direct links between feedback and performance, the effects of feedback on performance were investigated in a study of railway work crews by Pearson (1991), who found increases in productivity over time as a consequence of receiving performance feedback.

Feedback is also believed to influence motivation or learning through a three-step process (Blickensderfer, Cannon-Bowers, & Salas, 1997). First, feedback directs the attention of the individual performing the task to a particular aspect of the performance. Second, it provides information about the performance. Third, the information can then be utilized by the individual to change his or her behaviour via reinforcement or punishment.

In addition to feedback, an organizational reward system that support work team efforts can reinforce the motivational aspects of a well-designed team task. Hackman (1987) outlines three features of reward systems for work teams that support high effort. First, the system should be challenging, and should focus on specific performance objectives. Second, there should be positive consequences for excellent performance. Third, rewards and objectives that focus on group, not individual behaviour encourage a high degree of team effort. These outcomes can include public recognition and praise for team successes, team celebrations, or individual rewards such as preferred work assignments, desirable schedules or money (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990). Rewards can reinforce those behaviours that are in alignment with organizational values, such as open communication and collaboration (Hall & Beyerlin, 2000).

Rewards, if awarded to individuals rather than to the team for overall performance can have destructive effects (Hackman, 1987). If reward allocation to the team is not feasible, it may be better to base rewards on the performance of even larger groups, such as departments or divisions. Otherwise, rewards contingent on performance are not ideal in situations where members of a team are put into competitions with one another for scarce and valued rewards (Lawler, 1981).

Structural Factors

Structural factors are unlike contextual factors as they are not amenable to change, therefore representing potential barriers or constraints to effective performance (Morgeson, Aiman-Smith, & Campion, 1997). They are macro factors which comprise the organization's internal environment, and include the physical environment, organizational arrangements and technological systems. Although these variables seem logically related to group effectiveness, there has been little prior research examining their influence.

When considering the physical environment, the levels of communication and cohesion in a group may depend on the extent to which informal, face-to-face interaction is fostered by proximity of workstations and gathering places (Sundstrom, 1986). Territories can also reinforce or inhibit group boundaries and external exchange. In cases where the groups efforts are easily disrupted, effectiveness may be aided by enclosed group areas and by giving team members a reception room and conference room to hold meetings (Hall & Beyerlin, 2000). Physical environments that minimize stress-producing distractions and interruptions are also related to successful team experiences (May & Schwoerer, 1994). Managerial support is another contextual characteristic vital to the effectiveness of teams, as management controls resources such as material and information required to make group functioning possible (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993).

Team/Task Design Factors

These are the work team and task design factors that impact team effectiveness. Thus, the design of the work, design of the team (including knowledge, skills and

abilities), degree of interdependence required of the team members, as well as the decisions regarding team leadership all influence the subsequent success of the team.

Design of the work

A group can be expected to work effectively when there are certain conditions met regarding the task the teams are to perform (Hackman, 1987). First, the group task offers task variety and requires members to use a variety of relatively high-level skills. This task variety gives each member the chance to perform a number of the group's tasks, and motivates by allowing members to use different skills. Second, the group task is a whole and meaningful piece of work, with a visible outcome. This identity with a task that is meaningful may increase motivation because it increases a group's sense of responsibility. Third, the task provides group members with substantial autonomy for deciding how they do the work, in effect, the group "owns" the task and is responsible for the outcomes. Self-managing work groups have been implemented in many organizational settings in order to allow the workers autonomy in the workplace and will be discussed in more detail in later sections of this review. Last, work on the task generates regular, trustworthy feedback about how well the group is performing.

Hackman (1987) also states that group members are more likely to work hard on their task if the task itself is motivationally engaging and important with regard to the consequences on other organizational members or clients. Thus, if the groups work is unchallenging, is deemed routine by the members and offers no opportunity for feedback the members are more likely to develop antiproductivity norms.

Design of Team

The composition of the group is the most important condition affecting the amount of knowledge and skill members apply to their task, and is also a factor in team effectiveness. Hackman (1987) proposes that teams have the following four characteristics: high task-relevant expertise, group size, interpersonal and task skills, and diverse members.

Concerning *task relevant expertise*, Steiner (1972) maintained that the potential productivity of a team is equal to the sum of the individual abilities within a group. Thus, the most efficient way to make sure that a group has the expertise it needs for its work is to assign talented individuals to it. Stevens and Campion (1994) suggested several aspects of interpersonal knowledge, skills and abilities, conflict resolution, collaborative problem solving, and communication knowledge that should be considered when developing the performance of teams.

Group size is another factor that may intervene in the relationship between team composition and performance. When determining the size of the group that is needed for the task, it must be taken into account how many members are needed in order to accomplish the work assigned to them (Gladstein, 1984). Groups should be comprised of the smallest number of members required to accomplish the task (Goodman, Ravlin, & Argote, 1986). Other existing research on group size indicates that groups over 12 people are better at gathering information and smaller groups are better at reaching closure and completing goals (Robbins, 1995). The composition of teams may also be enhanced by allowing teams to choose their own members (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990).

Phenomena such as social loafing and diffusion of responsibility have been attributed to size of the team (Bowers, 2000). Also affected by size of the team is the perception of equity between reward and effort in the team. For example, in smaller teams rather than large teams, it may be easier to distinguish those members who are performing at high levels and to reward them appropriately.

If a group task is well designed (i.e., it provides the group considerable autonomy in managing a challenging piece of work), and if members of the group are diverse (i.e., they come from different demographic groups, represent different organizational groups, or have divergent personal views), then *interpersonal skills* at least at a moderate level are required to bring the task skills of the members to bear on the group's work (Hackman, 1987). Interpersonal processes can influence team effectiveness, because team performance may depend on the compatibility of team members especially in teams with long life spans (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990).

The extent to which team effectiveness is affected by *diversity* among members is a complicated matter. The manner in which groups are diverse can vary from study to study, and can include factors such as abilities, experiences, ethnic backgrounds, gender and attitudes. Theoretically, a diverse workforce should supply a rich array of different ideas to bear on organizational problems (Knouse & Dansby, 1999), and should produce higher quality work because it brings a broader set of perspectives, approaches and ideas to bear on problem solving (Cox, 1993). Moreover, a diverse workforce should be able to deal with varied demands and expectations of a diversified customer based (Knouse & Chretien, 1996). If a group is composed of excessively homogeneous members they may get along well but lack the resources needed to perform the task because the members

essentially replicate each other (Hackman, 1987). On the other hand, if a group is composed of an excessively heterogeneous group of people, then there may be a problem with agreement of values and perspectives that impede effective progress in their work.

In a study examining how different percentages in work-group diversity categories affected various measures of group effectiveness, gender and minority categories showed increases in perceived work-group effectiveness at a low (i.e. when the diversity subgroup is 11-30% of the work group) diversity level (Knouse and Dansby, 1999). If the proportion of minority members increases beyond 30% (50% for women), there is a potential for tension and conflict.

Closely linked to the discussion of diversity among group members is the *individual differences* between group members in three broad categories: biographical differences, personality differences and differences in abilities (Morgan & Lassiter, 1992). Biographical differences may include gender, race, age, educational background and sociocultural background. In one study, Watson, Kumar and Michaelson (1993) reported that culturally heterogeneous groups performed better over time than culturally homogeneous groups on selected aspects of task performance.

Research on the effects of group composition have also examined the influence of group-member *personality* on team outcomes (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998). One large scale study (Barrick & Mount, 1991) suggests that conscientiousness, which includes a dependability and volitional component, is an important performance related trait across most settings. However, most of these studies have been conducted in laboratory settings using creativity as the performance criterion. As well, the lack of a generally accepted taxonomy of personality is a reason for the lack of a cumulative

knowledge relating personality to actual team-work outcomes (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998).

Decades of research have supported the notion that a single factor, general cognitive ability (g), underlies performance on tests and that g is a critical factor in job performance (Ree, Earles, & Teachout, 1994). Although the magnitude of reported relationships has been inconsistent, research generally has found a positive relationship between team members' ability and team-level performance (Heslin, 1964). The rationale for this relationship is that teams composed of intelligent individuals should be able to develop effective systems of activity (LePine, Hollenbeck, Ilgen, & Hedlund, 1997).

Degree of Interdependence

Interdependence is the relationship among group members' tasks, or the extent to which members of groups are reliant on one another to perform their tasks given a particular job design (Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne, 1993). Interdependence, discussed previously with regard to feedback and rewards, is related to effectiveness because interdependent tasks can be completed more efficiently in a team (Campion, Papper, & Medsker, 1996). Interdependence also increases motivation by enhancing the sense of shared responsibility for, and reward value of, group accomplishment.

Team Member Selection

The selection of team members and is critical to team effectiveness. For instance, team members should be able to learn job appropriate skills via training, such as technical, coaching and stress management skills (May & Schwoerer, 1994); be able to listen, constructively solve conflict, and make good decisions. They should also

understand the perspectives of others (Purser & Pasmore, 1992); regard autonomy as a positive outcome (Pearce & Ravlin, 1987); have the necessary organizational and business experience (Gladstein, 1984); and have or develop the ability to lead teams on their tasks (Gladstein, 1984). Composition of teams may also be enhanced by allowing teams to choose their own members (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990) and by matching task complexity with group members' skills (May & Schworer, 1994).

Process Factors

These factors define interaction in the broadest sense. They include boundary management, cohesion, performance norms, communication, and potency as important considerations when implementing work teams to enhance effectiveness.

Boundary Management

Boundaries are depicted as both separating and linking work teams within their organization (Alderfer, 1987). Boundaries refer to features that differentiate one unit from others (Cherns, 1976), pose real or symbolic barriers to access or transfer of information, goods or people (Katz & Kahn, 1978), or serve as points of external exchange with other teams, customers, peers, competitors, or other entities (Friedlander, 1987). Boundaries define, at least partly, how a group needs to operate within its context to be effective (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990). If the boundaries become too loose or indistinct, the team may become overwhelmed and may lose its identity. The less the team interacts with the organizational surroundings, the higher the likelihood that the team may become isolated and lose touch with suppliers, manager, peers, or customers (Alderfer, 1987).

Cohesion

The construct of group cohesiveness has stimulated active research interests in areas such as organizational behaviour and military psychology (Mullen & Copper, 1994). It is defined as “the resultant forces which are acting on members to stay in a group” (Festinger, 1950, p. 274), and has been discussed as an important motivational factor influencing team performance (Weaver, Bowers, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1997). Team cohesion refers to the attitudes of team members toward each other, the team task, and the acceptance of team norms (Levy & Steelman, 1997).

However, a primary issue in researching team cohesion lies in the definition and measurement of the construct, and this lack of agreement regarding definition and measurement can be identified as a primary source of the mixed results typically found in the literature (Weaver, Bowers, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1997). For example, Griffith (1988) explored the components of team cohesion in a large sample of soldiers and identified four dimensions that characterize cohesiveness in army units. These were: the quality of instrumental and affective relationships among junior enlisted soldiers, the quality of the relationship between junior enlisted personnel and their leaders, the soldiers’ internalization of the army’s values and the soldiers’ confidence in their weaponry and their leaders. These four dimensions were positively related with desire to remain in the unit, soldier morale and satisfaction with the army. Zaccarro, Gualtieri and Minionis (1995) also reported that highly task-cohesive military teams under high temporal urgency performed as well on a decision-making task as did either high task-cohesive or low task-cohesive teams under low temporal urgency, suggesting that task cohesion can improve team decision making under time pressure. On the other hand,

performance effectiveness was not significantly affected by group cohesion in a military setting (Tziner & Vardi, 1982).

Performance Norms

In order to develop a task-appropriate performance strategy, a group needs a relatively clear map of the performance situation, including norms (Hackman, 1987). Of special importance is information about task requirements and constraints that may limit strategic options, the material resources available for use, and the people who will receive, review or use the group project and the standards they are likely to employ in assessing its adequacy.

Communication

Research seeking to discover the characteristics of effective teams inextricably links teamwork with communication (Blubaugh, 1989). Communicating a team's mission throughout the organization especially may help teams whose work is closely linked to that of other units (Pearce & Ravlin, 1987).

Potency

The process characteristic of potency refers to the belief by the group that it can be effective (Guzzo & Shea, 1992) and is similar to the lay term of "team spirit" and notions of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982). Hackman (1987) argues that groups with team spirit (potency) are more committed and willing to work hard for the group, but research in this area is limited.

Contingency Factors

Contingency factors represent aspects of the work environment that may limit the effectiveness of the many factors outlined above (Morgeson, Aiman-Smith, & Campion,

1997). One type of contingency factor is *resource availability* and refers to the managerial support that is offered to the team to assist them with goal achievement (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993). Management controls resources (e.g., material and information) required to make group functioning possible (Shea & Guzzo, 1987), and an organizations top management must support the use of these groups (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990). Although managerial support seems logically related to group effectiveness, there has been little research examining its influence on performance of work teams.

Another example of contingency factors revolve around *task characteristics*, encompassing task type, complexity and uncertainty (Morgeson, Aiman-Smith, & Campion, 1997). The type of task the team performs is critical to the understanding of relationships between composition and performance (Bowers, 2000). Tasks can be considered cognitive, performance, or production. These different types of tasks require different levels of coordination and teamwork, and distinct differences in team performance can be expected on these types of tasks.

Difficulty or complexity of the task determines the resources that the team must use to perform it (Bowers, 2000). A task that is of low difficulty requires less expenditure of team members' cognitive resources than a task that is of high difficulty. In a task of low difficulty, team members will have more resources to devote to coordination and teamwork, allowing for higher performance on the task.

Goals, the last contingency factor, is a critical component of reward systems that have an impact on effectiveness (Hall & Beyerlin, 2000). Team effectiveness may depend on having a clearly defined goal, mission or purpose in the organization (Shea & Guzzo,

1987), and may entail expectations for anticipating and designing new procedures as the task changes, as well as expectations regarding output, quality and timing. Gross (1995) indicated that goals should be realistic and fair, and are usually based on either historical or projected performance. Not only should goals exist for groups, but individual members' goals must be linked to the groups' goals to reach maximum effectiveness (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993).

Goals can be primarily cooperative or competitive, and orientation and intentions between people are profoundly affected by which one is in place (Tjosvold & Tjosvold, 1994). In cooperation, people want others to act effectively and expect others to want them to be effective, because it is in each person's self-interest to do so. On the other hand, competitive expectations lead people to promote their own interests at the expense of others, and even to actively interfere with each other (Johnson & Johnson, 1989).

It has been argued that goal-setting acts on performance by indicating task strategies and motivating persons to perform (Mitchell & Silver, 1990). The evidence is clear that, compared with the absence of goals (or the presence of ill-defined goals), specific, difficult goals for groups raise performance on those dimensions reflecting the content of the goal, meaning that goals for quantity tend to raise quantity, and so forth (Weldon & Weingart, 1993).

Performance Issues

One of the most obvious advantages of teams is that they offer a greater variety and amount of knowledge on which to draw, and have been shown to increase effectiveness/performance (Driskell & Salas, 1992). However, progress in studying and managing work teams depends on having a well-accepted, measurable criterion of

effectiveness (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990), where measurement has traditionally relied on specific criteria such as tons of coal extracted by mining teams, sales revenues produced by sales teams and manager ratings of project teams. Currently, there is no singular, uniform measure of performance effectiveness for groups (Guzzo & Dickson, 1996). Broadly defined, effectiveness in groups is indicated by group produced outputs (e.g., quantity or quality, speed and customer satisfaction), the consequences a group has for its members, or the enhancement of a team's capability to perform effectively in the future (Hackman, 1987).

Levy and Steelman (1997) provide an overview of what they believe are the required elements of team-based performance system. First, although the team is clearly the focus of the appraisal system, they point out that it would seem inappropriate to exclude evaluations at the individual level. This individual performance should consist of self-ratings, peer ratings, and possibly supervisor ratings if there is one who can observe the individual performance. Second, they suggest that an effective team-based appraisal system must include multiple raters evaluating team performance as well, where team performance should be rated by each team member and a leader or supervisor if one exists outside of the team. Third, they propose broadening the performance criterion to include such nontraditional performance dimensions as coordination and cooperation. Fourth, they propose that depending on the type of team, other individuals may be involved in the appraisal process. And last, they suggest that some teams produce an end-product which can, and should, be objectively measured.

Gladstein (1984) also presented a model that contains group effectiveness as the major output of small group behaviour. Gladstein defined group effectiveness as

consisting of three criteria: group performance, satisfaction of group-member needs, and the ability of the group to exist over time.

Team Learning

Another concept that has been addressed in the literature is that of team learning, which becomes a key to successfully coping with the dynamic complex environment that organizations face (Tompkins, 1997). Team learning has been defined as team members acquiring and sharing unique knowledge and information and examining what is helping and hurting team performance to continually improve as a unit (Druskat, 2000).

However, research has only begun to examine the empirical relationship between team learning and team performance, with some researchers finding positive, but not significant, relationships between these two variables.

Conflict

One challenge to team effectiveness is conflict which refers to the tension between team members due to real or perceived differences (Cohen & Bailey, 1997). It has been found that how teams manage their conflict is the crux of the teams effectiveness (Amason, Thompson, Hochwarter, & Harrison, 1995). Teams that were successful used conflict to their advantage to arouse discussion and stimulate creative thinking. Those teams that proved less successful did a poor job of managing and resolving their differences.

There are both positive and negative aspects to conflict, and at various levels in an organization (De Dreu, Harinck, & Van Vianen, A.E.M., 1999). Conflict has been associated with greater innovation and more effective interpersonal relations (Tjosvold,

1997), but also with lower effectiveness, reduced well-being and turnover (Spector & Jex, 1998).

Three responses to relationship conflict in teams have been proposed (Putnam and Wilson, 1982). First members may try collaborating with others and trying to work out a mutually acceptable solution. Second, members may try contending and trying to impose one's will, wishes and perspectives on others. Last, members may avoid the conflict issues and ignore the problem. Research has found that compared to avoiding, collaborating and contending are more likely to actively solve or escalate the conflict, respectively (Van de Vliert, & Euwema, 1994).

Virtual Teams

Virtual teams are a new method of work design that can assist organizations in meeting the challenges of market competition and turbulence, and has been defined as a self-knowledged work team, with distributed expertise, that forms and disbands to address specific organizational goals (Kristof, Brown, Sims, & Smith, 1995). This type of team is characterized by fluid human resources in terms of membership, leadership and function, organizational and geographic boundaries.

There are three levels of analysis at which the virtual team might be examined and described: the organizational level, the group level, and the individual level (Kristof, Brown, Sims, & Smith, 1995). Organizational culture is a critical support of the virtual team structure and philosophy, and many of the values needed to support the virtual team must exist at this level. The virtual teams' existence is project dependent and can be described at the group level through its formation, composition and processes (Kristof et al., 1995). At the individual level, members of virtual teams share a number of important

characteristics such as values about challenge, growth and education. As well, Kristof et al. have the ability and skills to appropriately allocate the talents among various teams.

These three levels combine together to create a support system for virtual teams.

Virtual teams provide the flexibility to bring the most skilled and competent individuals at appropriate times to meet organizational goals (Kristof, Brown, Sims, & Smith, 1995). Consulting firms use this type of team to accommodate multiple projects simultaneously.

Cross-Functional Teams

The importance of teams has grown during the past decade, as effective teams have found ways to leverage resources and improve work products and systems (Smart & Barnum, 2000). The emphasis on “cross-functional” is a reflection of the growing complexity of today’s work, where no single individual or job function possesses sufficient knowledge or skill for developing or maintaining innovative products or services. Professionals and specialists must work together in the workplace, since both can only be successful together and must apply their specific skills in conjunction with other professionals and employees (Tjosvold & Tjosvold, 1995).

Cross-functional teams are made up of people from different departments in an organization who typically perform different job functions, and bring a variety of skills and experience to their teams (Parker, 1994). Benefits from using cross-functional teams include increased speed with regard to the completion of the task, improved organizational capacity to solve complex problems, increased creative capacity of the organization by bringing together people with different backgrounds, and organizational

learning. This is essential as members learn more about other disciplines and tend to develop new technical and job skills more readily (Parker, 1994).

Self-Managing Work Teams

Definition

Self-Managing Work Teams (SMWT) have been labeled as “autonomous work groups” as well as “empowered teams”. This type of team involves the empowerment of the teams to take control and responsibility for their actions and team performance (Cohen, 1994). Some teams even have the responsibility for scheduling work hours and vacations, ordering materials, hiring and firing employees, and determining pay raises (Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, & Drascow, 2000). Hackman (1986) noted that although SMWTs have control over the immediate monitoring and management of the work task, they do not have responsibility for designing the work unit, its context, or setting larger organizational goals.

Among the key components of the SMWT are: interrelated tasks among groups of employees, employee discretion over tasks such as task assignments and plans for completion and face-to-face interaction. Membership is frequently based on selection by the organization or management, and voluntary in that individuals choose to apply for and accept offers to work as part of a team (Manz & Sims, 1993).

History

The perspective of SMWT emerged in response to challenges such as increases in employee dissatisfaction, absenteeism, turnover and counterproductive behaviour as well as declining productivity and quality (Cummings & Malloy, 1977). However, there was little use for these self-managed teams until the last decade or so when firms reduced

levels of management, thus handing over authority to workers that management once held, as well as seeking new ways of increasing employee productivity and involvement (Guzzo & Dickson, 1996). As well, increasingly complex, interdependent, and uncertain organizational environments have called for the use of more independent teams (Trist, 1977).

Benefits of SMWT

Many benefits have been attributed to the implementation of self-managing work teams, such as increased productivity, employee quality of work life (Manz & Sims, 1993; Wageman, 1997) and more favorable employee attitudes than were found with traditional work groups (Cordery, Mueller, & Smith, 1991). SMWTs also enhance organizational learning, adaptability and employee's commitment to the organization (Wageman, 1997). However, there have been mixed results with regard to absenteeism and turnover. Manz and Sims (1993) attributed decreases in absenteeism and turnover to the use of SMWTs, although Cordery et al. (1991) found that both factors were higher among members of autonomous work groups in comparison with traditional groups.

Costs and Risks of SMWT

Since SMWTs are a special type of group, and since they combine relatively high degrees of autonomy with responsibility and durability over time, SMWT are subject to more dramatic process losses than more traditional work groups (Polley & Van Dyne, 1994). However, these processes which apply in some degree to all teamwork, are especially likely to occur when SMWTs exist over a long period of time, or when teams are implemented in conditions that are less than ideal. These process losses suppress team effectiveness from its potential effectiveness (Rentsch & Hall, 1994), and are

engendered by such negative team activities as competition, conflict, waste and redundant effort (Steiner, 1972).

Social loafing is most pronounced when individual effort cannot be ascertained (Weldon & Gargano, 1988), and occurs when members fail to put forth their best effort because they believe their particular level of effort will not be discerned by others (Latane, Williams, & Harkins, 1979). In contrast, when individual effort can be observed and evaluated, participant performance improves. *Diffusion of responsibility* suggests that individuals may fail to take action when they expect that others will act (Polley & Van Dyne, 1994). *Polarization* occurs when the group takes a more extreme position than that taken by individual group members. *Groupthink* is a mode of thinking in which the group fails to critically evaluate its own ideas, choosing instead to “get along” rather than challenge their assumptions and perspectives (Amason, Thompson, Hochwarter, & Harrison, 1995). This process loss can impede collective decision-making processes and lead to poor decisions (Janis, 1982).

SMWT Evaluation

Cohen (1994) posits three major dimensions of SMWT effectiveness that provide an excellent start to evaluating effectiveness of SMWT. First, there is team performance, which consists of controlling costs, increasing productivity and increasing quality of products and/or services. Second, attitudes of team members, which include the quality of work life (satisfaction with the job, team, social relations and growth opportunities), organizational commitment and trust in management. Third, withdrawal behaviours such as absenteeism and turnover.

Success of SMWT

Cohen (1994) has identified four classes of design variables that are critical for SMWT success. First is group task design, which includes characteristics of the group task such as task variety and task significance. Group characteristics such as composition of the group are also relevant to the effectiveness of the team. Third, encouraging supervisory behaviours among members are important. Last is support of the organizational context for employee involvement.

For SMWT to be fully effective in the organization, it must be noted that where management has a high need to maintain power and exercise control, along with a low tolerance to let others control, the installation of SMWTs is almost certain to fail (Varney, 1994). Success with these types of teams depends primarily on the amount of control released by management and the willingness of management to allow the team to be accountable for their actions and decisions.

Team Development

A thorough process of planning and implementing teams in organizations has been developed (Morgeson, Aiman-Smith, & Campion, 1997). This process can be conceptualized as a series of six choices or decisions that must be made in creating teams. First, there is discontent, where organizational decision makers identify a gap that leads to change in the organization. Diagnosis is the next stage, where team implementers gather needed information. Next is data feedback and goal establishment. Fourth is planning and implementation that addresses issues around team design. Fifth, evaluation and feedback involves continual monitoring and communication. Last is stabilization,

and allows one to determine if the team has stabilized and is working effectively on a day-to-day basis.

Once teams are in place, team development reflects the premise that over time, teams change and develop new ways of operating as they adapt to their contexts (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990). Team development is designed to stimulate individual awareness and interpersonal skills, and is composed of regular feedback to the members on how they interacted and affected others in the team (Sunstrom et al., 1990). Team development and team building in SMWT attempts to provide teams with the information and incentives they need to manage themselves effectively (Tjosvold & Tjosvold, 1994).

PART 2: TEAM LEADERSHIP

Leadership is one of the most researched aspects of organizational life, and has been recognized through the ages as a primary means of influencing the behaviour of others. As organizations move toward flattening their structures, eliminating many middle-level management positions, the need for more leadership in those organizations at all levels becomes evident (House, 1995). Leadership theories are particularly attractive to organizations such as the military, whose success depends on the involvement and active participation of all organizational members (Kane, Tremble, & Trueman, 2000). The U.S. Army Doctrine has identified leadership as the most essential component of combat power or the ability to fight and win, and envisions that leaders contribute to effective unit performance by inspiring purpose, direction and will to win.

In order for a team leader to be effective, two things must occur. First, the leader must be seen by the team as being legitimate, and second, the leadership must be

functional in that it must help the team to accomplish its goals (Barker, 1996). This goal achievement is accomplished through specific leader behaviours that aid in goal achievement by the team.

Types of Leaders

Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) was one of the first to provide an explicit definition of transformational leadership based on a qualitative analysis of the biographies of various political leaders (Lowe & Galen, 1996). Burns (1978) drew from the literature on traits, leadership styles and leader-member exchange research to put forth his ideas. He proposed that the leadership process occurred in either a transformational or transactional way and that a better understanding of transformational leadership can be achieved from comparing and contrasting it with transactional leadership (Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). Some authors also describe concepts similar to transformational leadership such as charismatic, inspirational or visionary leadership (Bryman, 1992).

Bass (1985) outlines for dimensions of transformational leadership. First, charisma refers to the leader who provides vision and a sense of mission, instills pride, gains respect and trust, and increases optimism. Charismatic leaders excite, arouse and inspire their subordinates (Yammarino & Bass, 1990). More recently, this dimension has been referred to idealized influence, and involves risk sharing on the part of the leaders, a consideration of follower needs over personal needs, and ethical and moral conduct (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Inspiration, the second dimension, is concerned with the capacity of the leader to act as a model for subordinates, the communication of a vision and the use of symbols to focus efforts. The third dimension is that of individual consideration.

Instead of appealing to subordinates through a vision or mission, individual consideration is in part coaching and mentoring, and involves providing continuous feedback. It also links the individual's current needs to those of the organization. The last dimension, intellectual stimulation, refers to a leader who provides subordinates with a flow of challenging new ideas that are supposed to stimulate rethinking of old ways of doing things. Awareness of problems, thoughts, imagination, and recognition of beliefs in subordinates are aroused. Similarly, Burns (1978) states that transformational leaders motivate others by appealing to higher ideals and moral values and that these leaders must be able to define and articulate a vision for their organization.

The effectiveness of transformational leadership is well documented (Shamir, 1999), and support for the use of transformational leadership at all organizational levels is also evident (Avolio & Bass, 1995). Transformational leadership ratings positively correlate with measures of group efficacy, group potency, trust, cohesion, extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction (Avolio, Jung, Murry, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Transformational leadership is also related to indicators of leadership effectiveness such as subordinate motivation (Bass, 1990).

Shamir (1999) outlines eight theoretical flaws in the transformational leadership theory. First, there is ambiguity about underlying influence processes. Second, there is an overemphasis on dyadic process. Third, there is ambiguity about transformational behaviours. Fourth, there is ambiguity about the definition of the construct. Fifth, there has been an omission of important behaviours in the theory. Sixth, situational variables have not been specified. Seventh, negative effects of transformational leadership have

not been thoroughly researched. Eighth, transformational leadership theories do not describe the reciprocal influence that followers may have on leaders.

Transactional leadership

The transformational leader was posited as a contrast to the transactional leader who exchanges valent rewards contingent upon a display of desired behaviours (Burns, 1978), and is based on bureaucratic authority and legitimacy within the organization (Burns, 1978). Transactional leaders emphasize work standards, assignments and task-oriented goals, and tend to focus on task completion and employee compliance. In addition, these leaders tend to rely quite heavily on organizational rewards and punishments to influence employee performance (Tracey & Hinkin, 1998).

Three dimensions of transactional leadership have proposed by Bass (1985). The first dimension is contingent reinforcement or contingent reward whereby the leader rewards followers for attaining a specific performance level. The second dimension, closely related to third dimension, is active management by exception. Leaders who practice management by exception only take action when things go wrong and when standards are not met. The active type of this leader will seek deviations from standard procedures and takes action when irregularities occur. The third dimension is called passive management by exception, and characterizes leaders who only take action after deviations and irregularities have occurred. The difference between active and passive leaders who lead by management by exception is that in the active form the leader searches for deviations, whereas in the passive form the leader waits for problems to materialize. Burns (1978) argues that transactional leadership entails an exchange between leader and follower.

Transformational versus Transactional Leadership

A recent resurgence of interest in studying the topic of leadership appears to be accompanied by acceptance of the distinction between transactional and transformational leadership (Meindl, 1990). Hater and Bass (1988) point out that contrasting transactional and transformational leadership does not imply that the models are unrelated. Bass (1985) viewed the transformational/transactional leadership paradigm as being comprised of complementary rather than polar constructs, with transformational leadership building on transactional leadership, but not vice versa. Bass integrated the transformational and transactional styles by recognizing that both styles may be linked to the achievement of desired goals and objectives. This view proposes that the two styles are complementary in the sense that transformational leadership style is ineffective in the total absence of a transactional relationship between leader and subordinate (Bass, Avolio, & Goodheim, 1987).

Transformational leadership has been linked to various criteria of effectiveness. In one study Guzzo, Yost, Campbell and Shea (1993) suggested transactional and transformational leadership styles can positively affect group potency and effectiveness. Transformational leadership, when compared to transactional and laissez-faire leaders have also been shown to have higher performing work groups as well as subordinates who reported greater satisfaction and members who exerted extra effort to complete the task (Bass, 1985). In addition, transformational leadership is significantly related to other relevant outcome variables such as follower perceptions of role clarity, mission clarity, and openness of communication (Hinken & Tracey, 1994).

Charismatic Leadership

The original charismatic leadership theory by Weber (1947) described how followers attribute extraordinary qualities (charisma) to the leader. Others have modified and extended this theory to describe charismatic leadership in formal organizations (Conger, 1989). One such theory is that of Conger & Kanungo (1998) who list the key behaviours of charismatic leaders as articulating an innovative strategic vision, showing sensitivity to member needs, displaying unconventional behaviour, taking personal risks and showing sensitivity to the environment (identifying constraints, threats and opportunities). A similar theory by House (1977) lists behaviours such as articulating an appealing vision, emphasizing ideological aspects of the work, communicating high performance expectations, expressing confidence that subordinates can attain them, showing self-confidence, modeling exemplary behaviour and emphasizing collective identity.

Research has uncovered links between charismatic leadership behaviours and various effectiveness criteria. Charisma is important for effectiveness criteria such as job satisfaction, perceived effectiveness of the team, performance, cohesion, and prevention of burnout (Stoker and Remdisch, 1997; Fuller, Patterson, Hester, & Stringer, 1996).

Shamir (1999) outlines six weaknesses associated with charismatic leadership theory. First, there is ambiguity about the meaning of what charisma is. Second, there is ambiguity about the relative importance of the underlying influence processes. Third is the overemphasis on dyadic processes and not enough focus on group processes. Fourth, there is still ambiguity about the necessary conditions for attributions of charisma. Fifth

is the ambiguity about how charisma is lost by a leader, and last is the ambiguity about implications for organizational effectiveness.

Conceptually, transformational and charismatic leadership are similar and compatible, and this is a very important issue (Shamir, 1999). Many books and articles treat the two approaches as equivalent, although some researchers view the transformational and charismatic leadership as distinct but partially overlapping processes.

Situational Leadership

Situational leadership theory proposes that the optimal style of supervision (defined in terms of a combination of relationship oriented behaviour and task-oriented behaviour) changes as the level of follower maturity increases (Norris & Vecchio, 1992). This shift is such that low-maturity followers are seen as requiring a high level of task-oriented supervision combined with low-relationship oriented supervision, whereas high-maturity followers are seen as requiring a low level of both task- and relationship-oriented supervision.

Laissez-faire Leadership

Transformational and transactional leaders, seen as active leaders, are often contrasted with the extremely passive laissez-faire leadership (Yammarino & Bass, 1990). Laissez-faire refers to a leader who is not sufficiently motivated or adequately skilled to perform supervisory duties (Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). This type of leader avoids decision making and supervisory responsibility, and is inactive, rather than reactive or proactive (Hartog, et al., 1997). In a sense, this type of leadership

indicates an absence of leadership, and has been found to have a negative relationship with other, more active forms of leadership (Bass, 1990).

There has been little research linking this type of leadership to specific effectiveness criteria. However, Bass (1990) has concluded that there is a negative association between laissez-faire leadership and a variety of subordinate performance, effort and attitudinal indicators.

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

This perspective of leadership focuses on the explicit one-on-one relationships that develop between the leader and the follower in contrast to other leader-focused theories such as transformational and charismatic (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999). In this perspective, there is a link between follower performance and the quality and level of mutual trust, respect, and influence within those leader-follower relationships. Research in this area pays little attention to what leaders do to develop a relationship with followers (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999). How organizational context influences the emergence and effectiveness of leadership is a relatively unexplored issue (Avolio & Bass, 1988; Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999), and this will be discussed next.

Contextual Factors

One contextual variable that may influence leader behaviour effectiveness is the *organizational environment* (Yukl & Howell, 1999). These researchers propose that charismatic leaders are more likely to emerge and be effective in organizational environments characterized by a high degree of change or by great opportunities for change, rather than in environments that are stable. They further propose that stable environments offer few inducements for change or opportunities for change. This is

consistent with Bass and Avolio (1993), who reason that transformational leaders are more likely to find acceptance in organizations facing rapidly changing technologies and markets than operating under routine conditions.

There may also be certain *stages in organizational life cycles* when charismatic and transformational leadership may be more appropriate (Conger, 1999). It has been proposed that both transformational (Baliga & Hunt, 1988) and charismatic (Yukl & Howell, 1999) leadership are most important during the birth, growth and revitalization stages of an organization.

Another variable is *physical distance* (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999). Physical distance needs to be considered since dramatic changes in organizational structures, size, complexity and work arrangements can occur. In these cases, leaders are increasingly responsible for managing followers who reside in different locations. It has been argued that increasing the physical distance between leaders and followers decreases the opportunity for direct influence and potentially the effectiveness of the working relationship (Bass, 1990; Napier & Ferris, 1993).

Size of the work unit is another contextual variable that may have an impact on leader effectiveness (Cogliser & Schriesheim, 2000). Depending on the number of followers a leader has, the amount of time that could be spent with each one would vary, where larger work units may be related to less time with new employees.

Cohesiveness of the work unit should also be considered (Cogliser & Schriesheim, 2000). In a case where the group is highly cohesive, peer socialization may take place, limiting the interaction between supervisor and subordinate. It has been proposed that the relationship between the organizational context and individual behaviour or attitudes is

also mediated by *organizational climate* perceptions (Schneider, 1983). Various leader theories have also considered environmental factors related to *power or control* of the leader (Cogliser & Schriesheim, 2000). Types of power that a leader may have are expert, referent, legitimate, reward and coercive power (French & Raven, 1959).

Another factor that influences leadership effectiveness is the *type of organization* (Lowe & Galen, 1996). Transformational leadership is more likely to emerge and be effective in organizations with less constrictive (organic) environments (Bass 1985), compared with charismatic leadership that is proposed to be effective in more organic organizations. As well, leadership was more likely to emerge and be reported by subordinates in public versus private organizations (Lowe & Galen, 1996).

There has been some ambiguity with regard to whether leadership has the same impact on effectiveness as all *levels of the organization* (Lowe & Galen, 1996). It has been proposed that the relationship between leader behaviours and effectiveness will be higher at upper levels of management and weaker at lower levels of management. This proposal has been supported by researchers of both transformational (Avolio and Bass, 1988) and charismatic (Yukl & Howell, 1999) leadership. Leadership, though wide spread in organizations, was more likely at higher levels in the organization.

The *type of criterion* used to measure effectiveness is also a factor in exploring the relationship between leader behaviours and effectiveness (Lowe & Galen, 1996). In order to understand and to gain a clear understanding of how managers are performing in their jobs, or how to determine which leaders may benefit from specialized development programs, accurate and reliable measurement of leadership is critical (Tracey & Hinkin, 1998). However, many of the instruments available to measure leadership behaviours

have not been thoroughly examined and as such, careful consideration must be given to the measurement qualities of tools that are used to make diagnostic, developmental and evaluative decisions. Two measures that may possess utility in both the developmental and evaluative sense are the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), developed by Bass and Avolio (1990), and the Managerial Practices Survey (MPS) developed by Yukl (1990). Both measures may have distinct applicability as both appear to assess an unique set of leadership and managerial behaviours. The MLQ, in which respondents rate the behaviour of their superior, has been revised several times and is now widely used.

Team Leadership

As organizations move toward more team-based structures, one must consider the implications for leadership processes and development in this new team-based organization. Paramount in this new structure as well as in the military is an increased emphasis on work team leaders to guide and structure team experiences. This guidance is needed in order to facilitate the creation of teams, the development of teamwork skills, as well as skills that underlie the adaptive capabilities of effective teams (Kozlowski, Gully, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1996).

Leadership Systems

Two types of leadership systems that are needed in team based organizations are executive management and direct supervisory systems (Hall & Beyerlin, 2000).

Executive managers are defined as individuals who provide leadership functions at the broadest level of the organization (Mohrman, Cohen, & Mohrman, 1995), develop goals for the organization, provide resources, and develop systems that support employee collaboration. These leaders are critical to team effectiveness, because they control the

resources that make or break transitional efforts to teams (Dyer, 1994). Clarity of these leadership roles in an organization is important because management roles must be redefined to reflect lateral relationships instead of hierarchical relationships (Mohrman et al., 1995).

Direct supervisors are defined as the immediate external leaders of teams (Sims & Manz, 1994) and work more intimately with the team by providing resources, facilitating performance management functions, training and collaborating with other organizational components on behalf of the team. Whereas effectiveness at the macro-level of the organization is increased by executive management systems, direct supervisor systems work more intimately with teams. Direct supervisors are considered the immediate external leaders of groups, and facilitate the ultimate success of teams (Sims & Manz, 1994). Direct supervisors are extremely important to effective teams, because supervisors are the opinion leaders in organizations and can greatly influence organizational change efforts (Larkin & Larkin, 1996). These leaders also focus on the communication links between the teams and management, the training needs of employees, and the attainment of equipment and supplies to meet team goals (Sims & Manz, 1994).

Team Leader Theory

Leader behaviour capabilities, and how these capabilities can be used to develop teamwork skills, are not outlined in most leadership theories. A theory of team leadership and development requires a different approach than we have seen, and needs to focus on the melding of two individuals into a team, and on the integration of taskwork and teamwork skills. A theory presented by Kozlowski, Gully, Salas and Cannon-Bowers

(1996) addresses this issue and emphasizes two dynamic aspects of team leadership. One aspect specifies shifts in the leader's role as teams make developmental progress. The second aspect details how leaders can use variations in the team's task to create learning experiences.

The first aspect of team leadership is important to team development that represents the long-term evolution of the leader and team, their roles and relationship. Linked to this sequence of development is a corresponding set of leader roles that are intended to develop the shared, cognitive structure and behaviour necessary for involvement. When teams are newly formed, the leader (mentor role) must guide the team through a process that allows members to bond with their teammates, develop cohesion to a task and commitment to the team's goals. As the team makes the transition into demonstration of individual task performance and building self-efficacy, the leader (instructor role) must provide explicit technical schooling and practice experiences that help each member acquire or refine the proficiency that he or she needs. As individual proficiency improves, the leader (coach role) creates learning experiences that emphasize team goals and feedback, with the individual subordinate to the team. As the team develops greater expertise, the leader (facilitator role) facilitates effective team performance by helping them to make the best use of its shared affect, cognition and behaviour (Kozlowski et al., 1996).

Leaders use these variations in task intensity, complexity and work load to provide naturally occurring opportunity for the team to learn. These variations allow the leader to create, structure and guide learning through a sequence of goal-setting, monitoring, diagnosis and feedback. This interaction with the team focuses on the skills

to be developed and prepares the team for the next learning opportunity. It also allows the leader to successively guide the development of the team capabilities (Kozlowski, Gully, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1996).

Another model that focuses on ideas about leading teams and team effectiveness is that by Stoker and Remdisch (1997). This model focuses on leadership style, leadership activities, and leadership attitude in relation to team effectiveness at the organizational, team and individual level. Five leadership styles that are important for team effectiveness were identified: task-oriented, employee-oriented, participative, charismatic and coaching. Leadership activities may change depending on change in the organization. In some situations there is a decrease in leadership activities due to workers taking more responsibility, as well as situations where leadership activities increase such as the implementation of new work teams. Leader attitudes may change if they are faced with difficult leadership roles such as that of balancing leader guidance with employee participation. Reactions such as resistance to change, role conflict and unwillingness to relinquish power can inhibit team effectiveness (Stewart & Manz, 1995).

Effective versus Average Performing Teams

As companies struggle to remain competitive in the face of increasing domestic and global competition, there is an increased interest in specific behaviours of leaders that influence both the effectiveness of teams and the organization as a whole (Kolb, 1996). In one study of properties of high performing teams, leadership emerged as a characteristic particular to these teams (Larson & LaFasto, 1989). Specifically, thirteen behaviours that were shared by leaders of effective teams, regardless of the type of team,

were: articulating the team's goal in order to inspire commitment, avoiding compromising the team's objective with political issues, exhibiting personal commitment to the team's goal, not diluting the team's efforts with too many priorities, standing behind the team and supporting team members, being fair and impartial to all team members, exhibiting trust by giving members meaningful levels of responsibility, providing members the necessary autonomy to achieve results, being willing to confront and resolve issues associated with inadequate performance by team members, presenting challenging opportunities which stretch individual abilities, recognizing and rewarding superior performance, being open to new ideas and information from team members and being influential in getting outside constituencies to support team effort.

Effective leaders, rated by subordinate assessments, were also found to differ in their level of goal orientation, bottom-line orientation, communication and enforcement of standards, initiative, developing and coaching others, collaboration and team-building, systematic problem-solving, image and reputation and self-confidence. High performance leaders had higher scores in each of these categories of behaviour (Daniel, 1992). However, in this research, leaders were not working specifically with teams, but with randomly selected supervisors.

Leaders of high performing teams were also found to differ from those with average or low performing teams in two specific categories of behaviours (Kolb, 1996). High-performing leaders received higher scores on getting outside support as well as tolerance of uncertainty. However, they did not differ in the categories of exhibiting personal and/or professional qualities or confronting inadequate performance. Specific behaviours have also been linked with ineffective leadership or poor team performance,

such as putting pressure on team members to be productive and attendance of meetings (Manz & Angle, 1987)

Team Leadership and SMWT

There is a challenging and striking paradox in modern leadership, the one of leading people to lead themselves (Manz & Sims, 1987). In self-managing work groups, members are encouraged to be independent. However, even the most autonomous, independent or otherwise self-reliant work teams need some amount of direction, support and/or linkage to the organization's larger system (Nygren & Levine, 1996).

In order to measure specific leader behaviours in SMWT, the Self-Management Leadership Questionnaire was developed (Manz & Sims, 1987). This paper and pencil measure of leadership outlines six behaviour clusters: self-reinforcement, self-criticism, self-goal setting, self-observation, self-expectation and rehearsal. However, this measure appears to lack leader behaviours that are deemed important by other researchers. These behaviours include the dynamics of how control is exercised within the team, the fostering of team spirit, solidarity and commitment, and the handling of conflicts and disagreements (Hackman, 1990).

Feedback and Team Leadership

New methods of providing feedback to employees for the purposes of skill development and preparation for advancement are being explored (Smither & Wohlers, 1995). Feedback to leaders about their effectiveness can be given from sources other than peers and supervisors, such as upward feedback that is given by subordinates. This type of feedback is advantageous because it presents different views of the leaders performance, and multiple observers with similar perspectives increase the reliability of

the feedback. However, several important issues must be raised. First of all is the question of whether this information is found to be useful by the leaders. Also of importance is whether there is a behaviour change associated with such feedback. These questions were addressed by Smither and Wohler (1995) in a study of normative feedback (i.e., information about how the average team leader was rated) versus individualized feedback (i.e., ratings from the leader's team members). Team leaders who received individualized feedback viewed the feedback as more useful, were more willing to discuss the feedback with team members and were more satisfied with the feedback process. However, leaders who received individualized feedback did not indicate greater intentions to change their behaviour than leaders who received only normative feedback. In other words, although leaders may react favorably to receiving individualized feedback, merely providing such feedback may not lead to behaviour change.

Summary of Team Leadership

As stated previously, leadership is one of the most researched aspects of organizational life. The leadership theories that have been presented, and their link to teamwork, are particularly important to the Canadian Forces, as their success depends on the involvement and active participation of all organizational members. Particularly, there is an increased emphasis on work team leaders to guide and structure team experiences. This guidance is needed in order to facilitate the creation of teams, the development of teamwork skills, as well as skills that underlie the adaptive capabilities of effective teams (Kozlowski, Gully, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1996). As well, critical to the effectiveness of teams and the organization as a whole are particular behaviours of the

leader, such as inspiring commitment, supporting team members, delegating responsibility and providing challenging opportunities that support team growth and effort (Larson & LaFasto, 1989).

SECTION 3: RECOMMENDATIONS AND OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS

This paper was intended to review the literature with regard to teamwork and leadership, and in particular to identify the specific systems and factors (contextual, structural, team/task, process, contingency) that should be considered in supporting military team effectiveness. Through this analysis, it has become evident that there are several recommendations that can be made with regard to improving team effectiveness, as well as drawing a link between teamwork and military leadership.

Recommendation 1: Examination of Team Environment

The military could consider the environment that teams are working in, as some environments are more conducive to effective team performance than others. This should be done through the analysis of the specific culture, climate, training and feedback/reward systems that are in place. Organizations that favor innovation or incorporate shared expectation of success may be those that foster effectiveness (Galagan, 1986). Supporting climates are those that incorporate values such as harmony, openness, friendship, collaboration, encouragement, sociability, personal freedom and trust, and this should be considered in the military environment.

Recommendation 2: Feedback/Rewards Analysis

Other contextual factors that should be examined are the feedback and reward systems in place in the military, as these may influence employee satisfaction in work groups (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993). One should be aware that there is

conflicting evidence with regard to rewards in the team setting. Campion et al. (1993) note that individual feedback and rewards should be linked to the group's performance in order to motivate group-oriented behaviour. However, Hackman (1987) notes that rewards, if awarded to individuals rather than to the team for overall performance can have destructive effects.

In terms of feedback, a favourable feedback environment is one in which performance feedback is constructive (i.e., both positive and negative), specific, accurate and readily available (Levy & Steelman, 1997). Practitioners also agree that team effectiveness depends on accurate, timely feedback on performance (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990).

Recommendation 3: Analysis of Structural Factors

In particular, when considering structural factors and their relationship to teamwork effectiveness, physical environments in which teams work is a very important consideration. Effectiveness may be aided by enclosed work areas in cases where the groups are easily distracted, as well as through the proximity of the workstations and gathering places (Sundstrom, 1986; Hall, & Beyerlin, 2000). Managerial support of team progress and decision-making is also encouraged, and has been linked to team effectiveness (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993). This support is important as management controls resources such as material and information that is required to make group functioning possible. However, there has been little research in these areas, and this should be considered when deciding on policy or program change.

Recommendation 4: Analysis of Task/Team Design Factors

When considering the design of the work, a group can be expected to work effectively if the group task offers task variety and requires members to use a variety of relatively high-level skills (Hackman, 1987). This task variety motivates the team by allowing members to use different skills, and gives each member the chance to perform a number of the group's tasks. It is recommended that team tasks offer this variety.

The composition of the group is the most important condition affecting the amount of knowledge and skill members apply to their task, and is also a factor in team effectiveness. Considering this, it is recommended that teams have the following four characteristics: individual members have high task-relevant expertise; the group is just large enough to do the work; members have interpersonal skills as well as task skills; and memberships are moderately diverse (Hackman, 1987).

Specifically, team members should be selected who demonstrate abilities such as conflict resolution, collaborative problem solving and communication skills (Stevens & Campion, 1994). The impact on performance of those teams that self-select rather than are assigned to teams should also be explored (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990).

Recommendation 5: Group Cohesiveness

Group cohesiveness is an area of research that has been actively explored in the military environment (Mullen & Copper, 1994). Findings in this area have been mixed, and a thorough examination of any links between level of team cohesion and team performance should be explored.

Recommendation 6: Goals

Goals have been found to be a critical component of reward systems in the research (Hall, 2000), and team effectiveness may depend on having a clearly defined goal, mission or purpose in the organization (Shea & Guzzo, 1987). It is recommended that goals be explored to ensure that they are realistic and fair, clearly stated and based on either historical or projected performance (Gross, 1995). In addition, goals should not only exist for groups, but individual member's goals must be linked to the group's goals to be maximally effective (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993).

Recommendation 7: Performance Measurement

Research in team effectiveness will only progress if there is a well-accepted, measurable criterion of effectiveness (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1993). Performance based systems should include evaluations at the individual level, should include multiple raters and can include nontraditional performance dimensions such as coordination and cooperation (Levy & Steelman, 1997).

Recommendation 8: Conflict

How teams manage conflict determines the teams effectiveness (Cohen & Bailey) and this should be explored in the military. One consideration could be the support of collaboration between team members that would be more likely to actively solve conflict to improve team effectiveness (Van de Vliert & Euwema, 1994).

Recommendation 9: Cross-Functional Teams

With the military being a complex organization, the emphasis on working together in the workplace is paramount. Cross-functional teams should be considered, as

they typically bring a variety of skills and experience to the team environment (Parker, 1994).

Recommendation 10: Self-Managing Work Teams (SMWT)

There have been many benefits as well as process losses attributed to the implementation of SMWTs. The costs and risks of this type of group formation should be considered when forming teams of this type.

Recommendation 11: Transformational Leadership and Team Effectiveness

Transformational leadership, the leadership theory likely most relevant to the military, achieves positive results, and is very important when studying team effectiveness in the military. The emphasis in the military on work team leaders to guide and structure experiences is documented (Kozlowski, Gully, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1996). This leadership style has been linked to group efficacy, trust cohesion, extra effort and satisfaction (Avolio, Jung, Murry, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). It is recommended that direct supervisors, considered the immediate external leaders of groups, lead the team exhibiting leader behaviours that are particular to this style (Sims & Manz, 1994). These leaders create learning experiences for the team which in turn have an impact on team effectiveness and feelings of motivation and achievement (Kozlowski et al, 1996).

Outstanding Questions:

While there are several definitive findings with regard to various factors (contextual, structural, team/task, process, contingency) and their link to team effectiveness, there are still several questions remaining:

- 1: Do these factors vary as a function of work setting?
- 2: Does the importance of these factors differ as a result of team type?
- 3: Does the impact of these factors vary for different organizations?
- 4: Which of these factors are the most important for effective team performance?

These questions are stated predominantly in the research in private sector environments, and hold the possibility of being researched in the military context in the future.

References

Alderfer, C.P. (1987). An intergroup perspective on group dynamics. In J. Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of Organizational Behavior (pp. 190-222). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Alvesson, M. (1996). Leadership studies: From procedure and abstraction to reflexivity and situation. Leadership Quarterly, 7, 455-486.

Amason, A.C., Thompson, K.R., Hochwarter, W.A., & Harrison, A.W. (1995). An important dimension in successful management teams. Organizational Dynamics, 24(2), 20-35.

Arnold, J.A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J.A., & Drasgow, F. (2000). The empowering leadership questionnaire: The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviours. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21, 249-269.

Atwater, L., Penn, R., & Rucker, L. (1991). Personal qualities of charismatic leaders. Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 12(2), 7-10.

Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1988). Transformational leadership, charisma and beyond. In J.G. Hunt, B.R. Baliga, H.P. Dachler, & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.), Emerging leadership vistas. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 6, 199-218.

Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., & Jung, D.I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72, 441-462.

Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I., Murry, W., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Building highly developed teams: Focusing on shared leadership processes, efficacy, trust, and performance. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 3, 173-209.

Baliga, B.R., & Hunt, J.G. (1988). An organizational life cycle approach to leadership. In J.G. Hunt, B.R. Baliga, H.P. Dachler, & C.A., Schriesheim (Eds.), Emerging leadership vistas (pp. 129-149). Lexington, MA: Heath.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American Psychologist, 37, 122-147.

Barker, J.R. (1996). Communal-rational authority as the basis for leadership on self-managing teams. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 3, 105-126.

Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44, 1-26.

Barrick, M.R., Stewart, G.L., Neubert, M.J., & Mount, M.K. (1998). Relating member ability and personality to work-team processes and team effectiveness. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 377-391.

Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1990). Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.I. (1990). Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.I. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and Directions (pp. 49-80). New York: Academic Press.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.I. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.I., & Goodheim, L. (1987). Biography and the assessment of transformation leadership at the world class level. Journal of Management, 13, 7-19.

Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. (1968). Corporate excellence through grid organizational development. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Blickensderfer, E., Cannon-Bowers, J.A., & Salas, E. (1997). Theoretical bases for team self-correction: Fostering shared mental models. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 4, 249-279.

Blubaugh, J.A. (1989). Communication issues in team building: A review of the literature. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Fransico.

Bowers, C.A. (2000). When member homogeneity is needed in work teams. Small Group Research, 31(3), 305-328.

Bryman, A. (1992). Charisma and leadership in organizations. London: Sage.

Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Campion, M.A., Medsker, G.J., & Higgs, A.C. (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective work groups. Personnel Psychology, 46, 823-847.

Campion, M.A., Papper, E.M., & Medsker, G.J. (1996). Relations between work team characteristics and effectiveness: A replication and extension. Personnel Psychology, 49, 429-452.

Cannon-Bowers, J.A., Tannenbaum, S.I., Salas, E., & Volpe, C.E. (1995). Defining competencies and establishing team training requirements. In R.A. Guzzo, & E. Salas (Eds.), Team Effectiveness and Decision Making in Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cartwright, D. (1951). Achieving change in people: Some applications of group dynamics theory. Human Relations, 4, 381-392.

Choi, J.N., & Kim, M.U. (1999). The organizational application of groupthink and its limitations in organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84, 297-306.

Cherns, A. (1976). The principles of sociotechnical design. Human Relations, 29, 783-792.

Cogliser, C.C., & Schriesheim, C.A. (2000). Exploring work-team unit context and leader-member exchange: A multi-level perspective. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21, 487-511.

Cohen, S.G. (1994). Designing effective self-managing work teams. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 1, 67-102.

Cohen, S.G., & Bailey, D.E. (1997). What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. Journal of Management, 23, 239-290.

Conger, J.A. (1989). The charismatic leader: Behind the mystique of exceptional leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J.A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research.

Leadership Quarterly, 10, 145-170.

Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15, 439-452.

Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1998). Charismatic leadership in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Conger, J.A., Kanungo, R.N., & Menon, S.T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21, 747-767.

Cordery, J.L., Mueller, W.S., & Smith, L.M. (1991). Attitudinal and behavioral effects of autonomous group working: A longitudinal field study. Academy of Management, 34, 464-476.

Cox, J.F., & Sims, H.P. Jr. (1996). Leadership and team citizenship behavior: A model and measures. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 3, 1-41.

Cummings, T., & Malloy, W.S. (1977). Improving productivity and the quality of work life. New York: Praeger.

Daniel, T.L. (1992). Identifying critical leadership competencies of manufacturing supervisors in a major electronics corporation. Group and Organization Management, 17, 57-71.

De Dreu, C.K., Harinck, F., & Van Vianen, A.E.M. (1999). Conflict and performance in groups and organizations. In C.L. Cooper, & I.T. Robertson (Eds.),

International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (Vol. 14). Chichester: Wiley.

De Dreu, C.K.W., & Van Vianen, A.E.M. (2001). Managing relationship conflict and the effectiveness of organizational teams. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22, 309-328.

Driskell, J.E., & Salas, E. (1992). Collective behavior and team performance. Human Factors, 34(3), 277-288.

Druskat, V.U. (2000). Learning versus performance in short-term project teams. Small Group Research, 31, 328-354.

Dyer, W.G. (1994). Team building: Current issues and new alternatives. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Eason, L.A. (1992). Team style technical training and workforce effectiveness. Economic Development Review, 10(1), 80-82.

Festinger, L. (1950). Informal social communication. Psychological Review, 57, 271-282.

Fleenor, J.W., & McCauley, C.D. (1996). Self-other rating agreement and leader effectiveness. Leadership Quarterly, 7, 487-507.

Friedlander, F. (1987). The ecology of work groups. In J. Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of Organizational Behavior (pp. 301-314). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

French, J.R.P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright, & A. Zander (Eds.), Group dynamics (pp. 150-167). New York: Harper & Row.

Fuller, J.B., Patterson, C.E.P., Hester, K., & Stringer, D.Y. (1996). A quantitative review of research on charismatic leadership. Psychological Reports, 78, 271-287.

Galagan, P. (1986). Work teams that work. Training and Development Journal, 11, 33-35.

Gibson, C.B. (2001). Me and us: Differential relationships among goal-setting training, efficacy and effectiveness at the individual and team level. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22, 789-808.

Gladstein, D.L. (1984). Groups in context: A model of task group effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 29, 499-517.

Glaser, S.R. (1994). Teamwork and communication. Management Communication Quarterly, 7(3), 282-197.

Goodman, P.S., Ravlin, E.C., & Argote, L. (1986). Current thinking about groups: Setting the stage for new ideas. In P.S. Goodman (Ed.), Designing Effective Work Groups. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodwin, V.L., Wofford, J.C., & Whittington, J.L. (2001). A theoretical and empirical extension to the transformational leadership construct. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22, 759-774.

Griffith, J. (1988). Measurement of group cohesion in U.S. Army units. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 9, 149-171.

Gross, S.E. (1995). Compensation for teams: How to design and implement team-based reward programs. New York: AMACOM.

Gust-Thomason, S., & Yantis, J. T. (1998). Assessment of team leader effectiveness within self-managed teams. Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 22(2), 159-168.

Guzzo, R.A., & Dickson, M.W. (1996). Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance and effectiveness. Annual Review of Psychology, *47*, 307-338.

Guzzo, R.A., & Shea, G.P. (1992). Group performance and intergroup relations in organizations. In M.D. Dunnette, & L.M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (Vol. 3). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Guzzo, R.A., Yost, P., Campbell, R., & Shea, G. (1993). Potency in groups: Articulating a construct. British Journal of Social Psychology, *32*, 87-106.

Hackman, J.R. (1986). The psychology of self management in organizations. In M.S. Pollack, & R.O. Perloff (Eds.), Psychology and Work: Productivity, Change in Employment (pp. 89-136). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hackman, J.R. (1987). The design of work teams. In J. Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of organizational behavior (pp. 315-342). Englewood Cliffs, NJ : Prentice-Hall.

Hackman, J.R. (1990). Groups that work (and those that don't). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hackman, J.R., & Morris, C.G. (1975). Group tasks, group interaction process, and group performance effectiveness: A review and proposed integration. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental and social psychology, *8*, New York: Academic Press.

Hall, C.A., & Beyerlin, M.M. (2000). Support systems for teams: A taxonomy. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, *5*, 89-132.

Hartog, D.N.D., Van Muijen, J.J., & Koopman, P.L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, *70*, 19-34.

Hater, J.J., & Bass, B.M. (1988). Superior's evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, *73*, 695-702.

Heslin, R. (1964). Predicting group task effectiveness from member characteristics. Psychological Bulletin, *62*, 248-256.

Hinkin, T.R., & Tracey, J.B. (1994). Transformational leadership in the hospitality industry. Hospitality Research Journal, *18*, 49-63.

Hitt, W.D. (1993). The model leader: A fully functioning person. Leadership and Organization Development Journal, *14*, 4-11.

House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt, & L.L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R.J. (1995). Leadership in the twenty-first century: A spectacular inquiry. In Howard A (Ed.), The changing nature of work (pp. 411-450). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howell, J.M., & Hall-Merenda, K.E. (1999). The ties that bind: The impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, *84*, 680-694.

Jacobson, C. (2001). Dynamics of charismatic leadership: A process theory, simulation model, and tests. Leadership Quarterly, *12*, 75-113.

Janis, I.L. (1982). Groupthink: Psychological studies of policy decisions and fiascoes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1989). Cooperation and competition: Theory and Research. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Jones, S. (1997). Team performance measurement: Theoretical and applied issues. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 4, 115-139.

Judge, T.A., Higgins, C.A., Thoreson, C.J., & Barrick, M.R. (1999). The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. Personnel Psychology, 52, 621-652.

Kane, T.D., Tremble, Jr., & Trueman, R. (2000). Transformational leadership effects at different levels of the Army. Military Leadership, 12, 137-161.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). The Social Psychology of Organizations (2nd Ed.). New York: Wiley.

Katzenbach, J.R., & Smith, D.K. (1993). The discipline of teams. The Harvard Business Review, 71, 111-120.

Keller, T. (1999). Images of the familiar: Individual differences and implicit leadership theories. Leadership Quarterly, 10, 589-608.

Kenny, D.A., & Zaccaro, S.J. (1983). An estimate of variance due to traits in leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 678-685.

Kickul, J., & Neuman, G. (2000). Emergent leadership behaviors: The function of personality and cognitive ability in determining teamwork performance and KSAs. Journal of Business and Psychology, 15(1), 27-51.

Kirkpatrick, S.A., & Locke, E.A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 36-51.

Kivlighan, D.M., & Tarrant, J.M. (2001). Does group climate mediate the group leadership-group member outcome relationship? A test of Yalom's hypotheses about leadership priorities. Group Dynamics, 5(3), 220-234.

Knouse, S.B., & Dansby, M.R. (1999). Percentage of work-group diversity and work-group effectiveness. Journal of Psychology, 133, 486-495.

Knouse, S.B., & Chretien, D. (1996). Workforce diversity and TQM. In S.B. Krouse (Ed.), Human Resources Management Perspectives on TQM: Concepts and Practices. Milwaukee, WI: American Society for Quality Control Press.

Kolb, J.A. (1996). A comparison of leadership behaviors and competencies in high- and average-performing teams. Communication Reports, 9(2), 173-184.

Kolodny, H.F., & Kiggundu, M.N. (1980). Towards the development of a sociotechnical systems model in woodlands mechanical harvesting. Human Relations, 33, 623-645.

Kozlowski, S.W.J., Gully, S.M., Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J.A. (1996). Team leadership and development: Theory, principles, and guidelines for training leaders and teams. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 3, 253-291.

Kristof, A.L., Brown, K.G., Sims, H.P. Jr., & Smith, K.A. (1995). The virtual team: A case study and inductive model. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 2, 229-253.

Larkin, T.J., & Larkin, S. (1996). Reaching and changing frontline employees. Harvard Business Review, May-June, 95-104.

Larson, C.E., & LaFasto, F.M. (1989). Teamwork: What must go right, what can go wrong. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Latane, B., Williams, K., & Harkins, S. (1979). Many hands make the light work: The causes and consequences of social loafing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *37*, 822-832.

Lawler, E.E. (1981). Pay and Organization Development. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Lemon, M.A. (1997). Work groups or work teams? Cultural and psychological dimensions for their formation. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, *4*, 97-113.

LePine, J.A., Hollenbeck, J.R., Ilgen, D.R., & Hedlund, J. (1997). Effects of individual differences on the performance of hierarchical decision-making teams: Much more than g. Journal of Applied Psychology, *82*, 803-811.

Levy, P.E., & Steelman, L.A. (1997). Performance appraisal for team-based organizations: A prototypical multiple rater system. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, *4*, 141-165.

Lord, R.G., & Engle, E.M. (1996). Leadership, teams, and culture change: Changing processing structures and dynamics. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, *3*, 211-237.

Lowe, K.B., & Galen, K.K. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. Leadership Quarterly, *7*, 385-426.

Madzar, S. (2001). Subordinates' information inquiry: Exploring the effect of perceived leadership style and individual differences. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, *74*, 221-233.

Manz, C.C., & Angle, H. (1987). Can group self-management mean a loss of personal control: Triangulating a paradox. Group and Organization Studies, 11, 309-334.

Manz, C.C., & Sims, H.P. Jr. (1987). Leading workers to lead themselves: The external leadership of self-managing work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 32, 106-128.

Manz, C.C., & Sims, H.P. Jr. (1993). Business without bosses: How self-managing teams are building high performance companies. New York: Wiley.

Marshall-Mies, J.C., Fleishman, E.A., Martin, J.A., Zaccaro, S.J., Baughman, W.A., & McGee, M.L. (2000). Development and evaluation of cognitive and metacognitive measures for predicting leadership potential. Leadership Quarterly, 11, 135-154.

Martell, R.F., & DeSmet, A.L. (2001). A diagnostic-ratio approach to measuring beliefs about the leadership abilities of male and female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 1223-1231.

Masllyn, J.M., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leader-member exchange and its dimensions: Effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 697-708.

May, D.R., & Schwoerer, C.E. (1994). Developing effective work teams: Guidelines for fostering work team efficacy. Organization Development Journal, 12, 29-39.

McGrath, J.E. (1964). Social Psychology: A Brief Introduction. New York: Holt.

McManus, K. (2000). Do you have teams? IIE Solutions, 32(4), 21.

Meindl, J.R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior, 12, 159-203.

Metlay, W., Kaplan, I.T., & Rogers, E.E. (1994). Self-management in context. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 1, 167-185.

Mitchell, T.R., & Silver, W.S. (1990). Individual and group goals when workers are independent: Effects on task strategies and performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 185-193.

Mohrman, S.A., Cohen, S.G., & Mohrman, A.M. Jr. (1995). Designing team-based organizations: New forms for knowledge work. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, B.B., & Lassiter, D.L. (1992). Team composition and staffing. In R.W. Swezey & E. Salas (Eds.), Teams: Their training and performance. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Morgeson, F.P., Aiman-Smith, L.D., & Campion, M.A. (1997). Implementing work teams: Recommendations from organizational behavior and development theories. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 4, 1-44.

Mullen, B., & Copper, C. (1994). The relation between group cohesiveness and performance: An integration. Psychological Bulletin, 115, 210-227.

Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Harding, F.D., Jacobs, T.O., & Fleishman, E.A. (2000). Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. Leadership Quarterly, 11, 11-36.

Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Johnson, J.F., Diana, M., Gilbert, J.A., & Trelfall, K.V. (2000). Patterns of leader characteristics: Implications for performance and development. Leadership Quarterly, 11, 115-134.

Napier, B.J., & Ferris, G.R. (1993). Distance in organizations. Human Resource Management Review, 3, 321-357.

Neck, C.P., Connerly, M.L., & Manz, C.C. (1997). Toward a continuum of self-managing team development. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 4, 193-216.

Neck, C.P., Stewart, G.L., & Manz, C.C. (1996). Self-leaders within self-leading teams: Toward an optimal equilibrium. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 3, 43-65.

Norris, W.R., & Vecchio, R.P. (1992). Situational leadership theory. Group and Organization Management, 17, 331-342.

Nygren, R., & Levine, E.L. (1996). Leadership of work teams: Factors influencing team outcomes. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 3, 67-104.

Ortiz, A.E., & Johnson, D.W. (1996). The effect of positive goal and resource interdependence on individual performance. Journal of Social Psychology, 136(2), 243-250.

Parker, G.M. (1994). Cross-functional collaboration. Training and Development, 48, 49-53.

Pearce, J.A., & Ravlin, E.C. (1987). The design and activation of self-regulating work-groups. Human Relations, 40, 751-782.

Pearson, C.A.L. (1991). An assessment of extrinsic feedback on participation, role perceptions, motivation, and job satisfaction in a self-managed system for monitoring group achievement. Human Relations, 44, 517-537.

Philips, J.M., Douthitt, E.A., & Hyland, M.A.M. (2001). The role of justice in team member satisfaction with the leader and attachment to the team. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 316-325.

Polly, D., & Van Dyne, L. (1994). The limits and liabilities of self-managing work teams. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 1, 1-38.

Popper, M., & Zakkai, E. (1994). Transactional, charismatic and transformational leadership: Conditions conducive to their predominance. Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 15, 3-7.

Porras, J.I., & Robertson, P.J. (1987). Organization development theory: A typology and evaluation. In R.W. Woodman, & W.A. Pasmore (Eds.), Research in organizational change and development (Vol. 1). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Porras, J.I., & Robertson, P.J. (1992). Organizational development: Theory, practice, and research. In M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, (Vol. 3, 2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Poza, E.J., & Markus, M.L. (1980). Success story: The team approach to work restructuring. Organizational Dynamics, 8, 3-25.

Purser, R.E., & Pasmore, W.A. (1992). Organizing for learning. In W.A. Pasmore (Ed.), Research in Organizational Change and Development (Vol. 6) (pp. 37-114). JAI Press.

Putnam, L.L., & Wilson, C.E. (1982). Communicative strategies in organizational conflicts: Reliability and validity of a measurement scale. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), Communication Yearbook (Vol. 6). Sage: Beverly Hills.

Ree, M.J., Earles, J.A., & Teachout, M.S. (1994). Predicting job performance: Not much more than g. Journal of Applied Psychology, *79*, 518-524.

Rentsch, J.R., & Hall, R.J. (1994). Members of great teams think alike: A model of team effectiveness and schema similarity among team members. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, *1*, 223-261.

Resnick-West, S., & Von Glinow, M.A. (1990). Beyond the clash: Managing high technology professionals. In M.A. Von Glinow, & S.A. Mohrman (Eds.), Managing complexity in high technology organizations. New York: Oxford University Press.

Robbins, S.P. (1995). Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, applications. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Rousseau, D.M., & Cooke, R.A. (1998). Cultures of high reliability: Behavioral norms aboard a U.S. aircraft carrier. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA.

Saavedra, R., Earley, P.C., & Van Dyne, L. (1993). Complex interdependence in task-performing groups. Journal of Applied Psychology, *78*, 61-72.

Sarin, S., & Mahajan, V. (2001). The effect of reward structures on the performance of cross-functional product development teams. Journal of Marketing, *65*(2), 35-54.

Schneider, B. (1983). Interactional psychology and organizational behavior. In L.L. Cummings, & S. Kerr (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (pp. 1-31). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Shadur, M.A., Kienzle, R., & Rodwell, J.J. (1999). The relationship between organizational climate and employee perceptions of involvement. Group and Organization Management, 24(4), 479-504.

Shamir, B. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. Leadership Quarterly, 10, 285-306.

Shamir, B., Zakay, E., & Popper, M. (1998). Correlates of charismatic leader behavior in military units: Subordinates' attitudes, unit characteristics, and superiors' appraisals of leader performance. Academy of Management Journal, 41, 387-409.

Shea, G.P., & Guzzo, R.A. (1987). Groups as Human Resources. In K.M. Rowland, & G.R. Ferris (Eds.), Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management (Vol. 5), Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Sims, H.P. Jr., & Manz, C.C. (1994). The leadership of self-managing work teams. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 1, 187-221.

Smart, K.L., & Barnum, C. (2000). Communication in cross-functional teams: An introduction to this special issue. Technical Communication, 47, 19-23.

Smither, J.W., & Wohlers, A.J. (1995). A field study of reactions to normative versus individualized upward feedback. Group and Organization Management, 20(1), 61-90.

Sosik, J.J., Avolio, B.J., & Kahai, S.S. (1997). Effects of leadership style and anonymity on group potency and effectiveness in a group decision support system environment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 89-103.

Spector, P.E., & Jex, S.M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal conflict at work scale, organizational constraints

scale, quantitative work load inventory, and physical symptoms inventory. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3, 356-367.

Steckler, N., & Fondas, N. (1995). Building team leader effectiveness: A diagnostic tool. Organizational Dynamics, 23(3), 20-36.

Steiner, I.D. (1972). Group Processes and Productivity. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Stewart, G.L., & Manz, C.C. (1995). Leadership for self-managing work teams: A typology and integrative model. Human Relations, 48, 747-770.

Stoker, J.I., & Remdisch, S. (1997). Leading work teams: Directions for team effectiveness. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 4, 79-96.

Stout, R.J., Salas, E., & Fowlkes, J.E. (1997). Enhancing teamwork in complex environment through team training. Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Psychodrama & Sociometry, 49(4), 163-187.

Strom, P.S., & Strom, R.D. (1999). Making students accountable for teamwork. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 23(2), 171-193.

Sundstrom, E. (1986). Work Places. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sundstrum, E., De Meuse, K.P., & Futrell, D. (1990). Work teams. American Psychologist, 45, 120-133.

Taggar, S., & Hackett, R.(1999). Leadership emergence in autonomous work teams: Antecedents and outcomes. Personnel Psychology, 52(4), 899-927.

Taggar, S., Hackett, R., & Saha, S. (1999). Leadership emergence in autonomous work teams: Antecedents and outcomes. Personnel Psychology, 52, 899-926.

Tjosvold, D. (1997). Conflict within interdependence: Its value for productivity and individuality. In D.K. De Dreu, & E. Van de Vliert (Eds.), Using conflict in organizations. Sage: Thousand Oaks.

Tjosvold, D., & Tjosvold, M.T. (1994). Cooperation, competition, and constructive controversy: Knowledge to empower for self-managing work teams. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 1, 119-144.

Tjosvold, D., & Tjosvold, M.T. (1995). Cross functional teamwork: The challenge of involving professionals. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 2, 1-34.

Tomkins, T.C. (1997). A developmental approach to organizational learning teams: A model and illustrative research. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 4, 281-302.

Tracey, J.B., & Hinkin, T.R. (1998). Transformational leadership or effective managerial practices? Group & Organization Management, 23, 220-237.

Trist, E. (1977). Collaboration in work settings: A personal perspective. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13, 268-278.

Tubbs, S.L. (1994). The historical roots of self-managing work teams in the twentieth century: Annotated bibliography. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, 1, 39-66.

Tziner, A., & Eden, D. (1995). Effects of crew composition on crew performance: Does the whole equal the sum of its parts? Journal of Applied Psychology, 70, 85-93.

Tziner, A., & Vardi, Y. (1982). Effects of command style and group cohesiveness on the performance effectiveness of self-selected tank crews. Journal of Applied Psychology, *67*, 769-775.

Van de Vliert, E., & Euwema, M. (1994). Agreeableness and activeness as components of conflict behaviors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *66*, 674-687.

Varney, G.H. (1994). Control and autonomy: The primary determinant of successful applications for self-managing work teams. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, *1*, 103-118.

Wageman, R. (1997). Critical success factors for creating superb self-managing teams. Organizational Dynamics, *26*(1), 49-61.

Waldman, D.A., Bass, B.M., & Einstein, W.O. (1987). Leadership and outcomes of performance appraisal processes. Journal of Occupational Psychology, *60*, 177-186.

Wallach, E. (1983). Individuals and organizations: The cultural match. Training and Development Journal, *37*, 29-36.

Watson, W.E., Kumar, K., & Michaelson, L.K. (1993). Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. Academy of Management Journal, *36*, 590-602.

Weaver, J.L., Bowers, C.A., Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J.A. (1997). Motivation in teams. Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, *4*, 167-191.

Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organizations. New York: Free Press.

Weldon, E., & Gargano, G.M. (1988). Cognitive loafing: The effects of accountability and shared responsibility on cognitive effort. Personality and Social Psychology, 14, 159-171.

Weldon, E., & Weingart, L.R. (1993). Group goals and group performance. British Journal of Social Psychology, 32, 307-34.

Williams, M.L., Posakoff, P.M., & Huber, V. (1992). Effects of group-level and individual-level variation in leader behaviours on subordinate attitudes and performance. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65, 115-129.

Williams, M.L., Podsakoff, P.M., Todor, W.D., Huber, V.L., Howell, J.P., & Dorfman, P.W. (1988). A preliminary analysis of the construct validity of Kerr and Jermier's "Substitutes for Leadership" scales. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 61, 307-333.

Yammarino, F.J., & Bass, B.M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In Clark KE & Clark MB (Eds.), Measures of leadership. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Yorges, S.L., Weiss, H.M., & Strickland, O.J. (1999). The effect of leader outcomes on influence, attributions, and perceptions of charisma. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84, 428-436.

Yukl, G. (1990). COMPASS: The Managerial Practices Survey. New York: Author/Marius Associates.

Yukl, G., & Howell, J.M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, *10*, 257-284.

Zaccarro, S.J., Galtieri, J., & Minionis, D. (1995). Task cohesion as a facilitator of team decision making under temporal urgency. Military Psychology, *7*, 77-93.