If the manager is to make the most effective use of staff, then it is important to have an understanding of group processes and behaviour. It is necessary to understand the nature of group functions and roles, and factors which influence their performance and effectiveness. Attention must be given to the analysis of behaviour of individuals in group situations. The manager must be aware of the functioning and operation of work groups and teams.

The learning objectives of this chapter are to:
- explain interactions among members of a group and membership of successful teams;
- detail patterns of communication networks within small work groups;
- examine methods of analysing behaviour of individuals in group situations;
- distinguish different group functions and member roles, and explain the use of frameworks of behavioural analysis;
- evaluate the nature of group performance and effectiveness;
- assess the nature and value of group dynamics;
- recognise the importance of understanding the functioning and operation of work groups.

Chapter 14 examines the processes and behaviour of people in work groups. Most activities of the organisation require at least some degree of cooperation through the functioning of group working. This chapter looks at patterns of communication networks in groups, the analysis of individual behaviour, different functions and member roles, group performance and effectiveness, and the nature of group dynamics.

Patterns of communication

Group performance and the satisfaction derived by individuals are influenced by the interactions among members of the group. The level of interaction is determined by the structuring of channels of communication. Laboratory studies have identified five main types of communication networks in small work groups – Wheel, Circle, All Channel, Y, and Chains. Findings from these studies indicate that the greater the amount of interconnectedness of the network, the higher the general level of satisfaction of members in the group (Figures 14.2 and 14.3).

Despite the artificiality of communication network studies, they do have important implications for the manager. They provide a reasonable representation of the situations that might be found in large organisations. A knowledge of the findings may be applied to influence patterns of communications in meetings and committees. No one network is likely to be effective for a range of given problems. The manager can observe the patterns of communication adopted by different groups in different situations.

Analysis of behaviour in groups

In order to understand and to influence the functioning and operation of a group it is necessary to study patterns of interaction, and the parts played by individual members. Two of the main methods of analysing the behaviour of individuals in group situations are sociometry and interaction process analysis.
Sociometry
This is a method of indicating the feelings of acceptance or rejection among members of a group. A sociogram is a diagrammatical illustration of the pattern of interpersonal relationships derived from sociometry. An example of a simple sociogram is given in Figure 14.4. It is important to draw attention to the information on constructing a sociogram, and to potential criticisms and limitations.

Interaction analysis
This is based on the assumption that behaviour in groups may be analysed from the viewpoint of its function. The aim is to provide ways of describing group process and indications of factors influencing the process. Several frameworks have been designed for observers to categorise patterns of verbal and non-verbal behaviour of group members. It is important that the framework does not become too complex, and to bear in mind that the observer’s own personality, values and attitudes can influence the categorisation of behaviour.

Group performance and effectiveness
It is difficult to draw firm conclusions from a comparison between individual and group performance. Considerations here include the idea of ‘groupthink’ and the phenomenon of the ‘risky-shift’. There are also some doubts about the effectiveness of brainstorming groups and group decision-making. However, groups will always form part of the pattern of work organisation. It is a matter of judgement for the manager to decide how best to use groups in the execution of work.

Group dynamics
Interest in the study of group process and behaviour has led to the development of group dynamics and a range of group training methods aimed at increasing group effectiveness through improving social interaction skills. A usual method is the T-group (training group) sometimes called ‘laboratory training’. A simple framework for looking at self-insight to help individuals in the T-Group process is the ‘Johari’ window (see Figure 14.10). Reactions to the value and effectiveness of T-groups is very mixed, and it is important to draw attention to the discussion on their evaluation.

Debate
‘Individuals will complete a task more efficiently and effectively than a group. And training in group dynamics, whilst interesting, has no practical value as a means of increasing the standard of group performance.’

Some starting points
For
- There are too many uncertainties surrounding groups such as groupthink and risky-shift which make them suspect. And people prefer to be evaluated on their own performance, and to see a direct link between their own effort and outcome.
- Group dynamics can identify and highlight more problems than it can solve, and as a result actually detract from overall performance.

Against
- In a group there is a greater likelihood of creativity in both problem-solving and implementing decisions. Groups will happen anyway, so we might as well harness their strengths.
- Managers need to understand how a group functions and how people relate to each other. A knowledge of group dynamics can help lead the group to greater self-awareness and empowerment to improve performance and effectiveness.
Assignment 1: Groups

Analysis of behaviour in groups

The process of group discussion is concerned with the analysis of behaviour from the viewpoint of its function. If a group is to be effective, then whatever its structure or the pattern of interrelationships among its members, there are two main sets of functions or processes that must be undertaken – task functions and maintenance functions.

- **Task functions** are directed towards problem solving, the accomplishment of the tasks of the group and the achievement of its goals. Most of the task-oriented behaviour will be concerned with ‘production’ activities, or the exchange and evaluation of ideas and information.

- **Maintenance functions** are concerned with the emotional life of the group and directed towards building and maintaining the group as an effective working unit. Most of the maintenance-oriented behaviour will be concerned with relationships among group members, giving encouragement and support, maintaining cohesiveness, and the resolution of conflict.

In addition to these two types of behaviour, members of a group may say or do something in attempting to satisfy some personal need or goal. The display of behaviour in this way is termed **self-oriented behaviour**.

The simple grid can be completed by drawing on the information about the classification of member roles.

- **Group task roles**. These assume that the task of the group is to select, define and solve common problems. Any of the roles may be performed by the various members or the group leader.

- **Group building and maintenance roles**. The analysis of member-functions is oriented towards activities which build group-centred attitudes, or maintain group-centred behaviour. Contributions may involve a number of roles, and members or the leader may perform each of these roles.

- **Individual roles**. These are directed towards the satisfaction of personal needs. Their purpose is not related to either group task or group functioning.

Assignment 2: My role in the team

This assignment provides an opportunity for course members to consider the roles which they play within the team and identify which roles could be developed and used more to increase their effectiveness.

After completing ‘The team role – self-assessment sheet’ and ‘The team role – colleague assessment sheet’ course members could be encouraged to consider a Personal Improvement Plan and to review both their strong and their weak roles, the roles which need to be developed and how best to undertake this development.

Assignment 3

Membership of groups and effective teamworking is becoming an increasing feature of the work organisation. This assignment provides an opportunity for course members to demonstrate their understanding of the contents of this chapter, and to consider and review the nature of group processes and behaviour. It also provides an opportunity to draw upon related areas of study including for example the functional or group approach to leadership (Chapter 8).

The main purpose of Task 4 (Sociometry) is to help encourage meaningful discussions on patterns of social interactions and the perceptions of individual members towards one another. It is important to have established an atmosphere of trust and a non-threatening environment, and that confidence will be honoured. If feedback is given to the group each member should be given
a random letter (known only to that member). Avoid using an alphabetical, class or similar listing by which members could easily work out which letter refers to which member.

**Assignment 4**

The purpose of brainstorming exercises is to encourage group members to adopt a freewheeling approach and to generate as many ideas as possible, however apparently far-fetched. Course members should be reminded to suspend immediate judgement, that brainstorming is based on creative thinking and that the quantity of initial ideas will lead to quality of ideas.

Group members should not forget the ‘obvious’ uses: for example to help with one’s study, or to hold up one’s trousers or slacks. Among the numerous potential uses which may not be quite so readily apparent, and by way of just a few examples, are:

- As a weapon, a door stop, a weight, a support, a status symbol, to stand on, to use the pages for toilet paper or to light a fire or to soak up liquid or to cut out words for anonymous messages, etc.
- As a fan belt, a strop, a tourniquet, a straight edge, a measure, a tie, to hang something, to cut up to make washers, to use the buckle as a weapon or can opener, to use the pin to pierce holes, etc.

**Additional seminar activities**

**Case study: Just another cog in the machine?**

Englishmen have been known to behave in a superior way about their cricket: what other country can boast a competitive event of such complexity and which lasts five whole days? ‘Le Tour de France’, reply the equally smug French, who as good as founded cycling by inventing the penny-farthing in the 1860s.

The Tour can last twenty-four days, involving nearly 200 competitors who endure all kinds of weather from Mediterranean heatwaves to mountain blizzards and cycle nearly 2500 miles, crossing borders into as many as seven countries. Like cricket, its jargon is so impenetrable that books about it need a glossary and the outsider might well be forgiven for thinking that, as in cricket, for hour after hour nothing really happens. When it comes to the Tour, Frenchmen have it in their bones, but the English can find themselves on a sticky wicket. Would they know the difference between the yellow, the green and the polka-dot jerseys? Or between the general ranking, the team ranking and the points ranking? The standard stage, the time trial stage and the criterium? What réel, fictif, and village starts are? Do they understand what an escape is? Or a domestique? Or a neutralised section? Yet this is the biggest annual sporting event in the world: it is claimed that twenty million people watch it from the roadside and that nine hundred million in more than 120 countries watch it on television.

The event is clearly extremely complex, involving many interacting groups. The Société du Tour de France, a body roughly thirty-strong, connected with a company that publishes two sports papers in France, has to co-ordinate a great variety of groups, all necessary to the operation. There are the local authorities of the towns and counties that host the start of each stage of the race (and who pay tens of thousands of pounds for the privilege), police departments throughout on the route (for shutting off roads, attending to security, etc.), sponsors who make up the huge publicity cavalcade (1500 vehicles) that precedes the cycle race and who cover 60 per cent of the Tour’s costs, the hoteliers who will house and feed the Tour at each stage, journalists who need to follow the race with their cameras and microphones in their shared cars and on motor bikes, medical services, the army of stewards, timekeepers and judges, and, of course, the racing teams themselves, usually about twenty, with nine riders each.
Each of these groups are complex in themselves, of course. Just to take the racing teams, they include the cyclists, their manager, their soigneur (who looks after the athletes’ physical needs, including their daily massage), their mechanic (an honour and a privilege in the Italian teams, says Laurent Fignon, Tour winner in 1983 and 1984), and sometimes their doctor, whose job is not merely to attend to injuries (falls during races are not at all infrequent) but also to supervise the riders’ diet and prescribe the many products riders need to accomplish such a gruelling feat. These include vitamins and minerals and, it is often alleged, stronger fare. Paul Kimmage, a successful Irish racer, has written about such practices in his book *A Rough Ride* (1990). As well as good-humoured games like ‘hunt the syringe’ in riders’ back pockets, Kimmage also speaks movingly of the pressure he felt to conform with group practices in this illegal and dangerous area. The first ever English rider to wear the overall leader’s yellow jersey, Tommy Simpson, died on a climb in the 1967 Tour from a combination of the exertion and drugs.

Inevitably, then, a group with such a variety of roles will have complex dynamics. To look just at the cyclists, it could seem that the key is to blend teamwork and a share of the limelight for each individual. Teams in recent times, however, have been sponsored by commercial firms such as Panasonic, Motorola and Renault who obviously want as high a profile as possible for their products. One result is that the cyclists fall into two categories, the leader(s) and the team riders. The leader is the star and it is the job of his team to do everything they can to help him win. These domestiques must shelter him from the wind, if he gets behind, pace him back into the peloton (the main pack, a minimum of about twenty riders who spend most of the stage together making the job that much easier for all its members), fetch food and water for him, give him their bikes if needed and even push him while he urinates. In return they get reflected glory and, as a consequence of their efforts, often most of the cash the star wins. All the riders are required to exhibit on their clothing the names of the many subsidiary sponsors who help with the cost of the venture, and are encouraged to wear team tracksuits at all non-racing times. In practice, rooming, planning, eating and, of course, racing together, mean that there is precious little time for partners or wives during the month of the Tour.

Clearly the task of the team manager/trainer is a particularly complex one. He has to handle the star, who sometimes demands more control than he should have, the jealousies and disappointments of the team riders, the esteem needs of absolutely vital contributors such as the mechanic, the solicitations from outsiders such as the media and hangers-on, the demands of the sponsors and so on. He needs authority but has to be a friend too, dealing with individuals from different social classes (unlike, say, the medical staff or indeed the first competitive cyclists, many racers come from working-class, often rural, backgrounds), frequently many different countries (since teams are no longer nationally representative), and different ages. The Peugeot team of 1982 actually had so many stars (Roche, Millar and Yates) that it did badly because they competed with each other. The new manager had to cut down the number of top riders to get the team back to winning ways.

Launched in 1903, the Tour’s history is bristling with stories that add colour to the rather general description above. Racing had begun well before the Tour though, for manufacturers organised races to promote their cycling wares. They found that longer races were more effective for this and an early anecdote concerns the winner of the 1500-kilometre race in the *vélodrome d’hiver* in 1893, who devised a tube to urinate down while riding, thereby avoiding stops. To motivate racers now, the Tour offers prizes for practically everything: the longest breakaway, the most combative performance, the most elegant rider, the most amiable . . . It was as prize money grew (well over a million pounds now in the Tour) that more working-class riders were attracted to the sport. One of the first champions actually rode a bike all day as a news courier and the competitiveness is aptly illustrated by the incident where a pretty admirer offered him a rose, which his manager snatched away just in time to avoid his rider being chloroformed by it. The Tour was launched as part of a circulation war between two sports papers and, in earlier
races, competing commercial concerns and towns were not averse to scattering glass or nails on the road to halt the show in front of their patch. Even now, a rider might be permitted by his opponents to lead the field as he goes through his home village. But it was not unknown for riders to be deliberately obstructed, even beaten up, or for the riders themselves to take a train to get ahead. One photo of the 1927 Tour shows a group of riders having a break for a cigarette. When urine tests came in, competitors occasionally topped up their sample with someone else’s offering. One tested cyclist, relieved to get a negative report was, however, surprised to find that he was pregnant!

Renowned for his aggression (‘Being a racing cyclist makes you both aggressive and vindictive’), Bernard Hinault was, until 1995, one of only three riders to have won the Tour five times. His dealings with team-mate Greg LeMond were much criticised during his winning years, especially in the 1985 and 1986 Tours (‘Americans seem to me to be lacking in humility!’). Less dramatic, but more interesting perhaps, is his reputation for being a highly professional cyclist who knew how to organise his team so that he would win with as little effort as possible. This is one area where the English do need tuition if they are to understand how careful planning can produce strategies which slow the race down, impede dangerous competitors, give up small prizes to secure the big one, and so on. It is a highly technical matter but a fascinating example of how the work group can control the job. Hinault took this attitude into the public arena when he led a riders’ strike to stop the organisers making the riders take tiring train journeys between Tour stages in search of more demanding, dramatic and therefore lucrative routes. As it is, up to 40 per cent of the competitors fail to finish the race.

Despite his ruthless reputation, Hinault was very team-oriented, insisting on the sharing of plans, giving team riders their chances, seeing they received large parts of the prize money, arguing that roaming arrangements should be on a rota so that everyone got to know everyone else, changing places at the meal table – in other words insisting that the social and the task functions of the group were each attended to. ‘You don’t win races alone,’ he said, ‘you win because others help you and sacrifice their own chances.’ When he changed to Bernard Tapie’s team in 1983 he found there was a financial and public relations manager in addition to the usual mix. To be fair, too, Greg LeMond did win in 1986 and seemed to build on Hinault’s example by being even more businesslike and determined. He was shot in a hunting incident in 1987, yet got back to fitness and won the Tour again in 1989 and 1990. The French often found his American approach to the race rather odd, especially the way he frequently had his family with him. But as he said himself, ‘I have won for a team of which my family is part.’ The 1990s star is not French either. Miguel Indurain, a Spaniard, rode in 1994 to become only the second rider in history to win the Tour four times in succession. Happily for the French, the first was a Norman, Jacques Anquetil.

For the comic writer Pierre Daninos, the Tour is distinguished by the fact that it is the police themselves, some twenty thousand of them, that actually paralyse the traffic. Cricket would hardly cause such a standstill. Twenty times more people watch football matches than cricket matches in Britain. And to some extent the popularity of a sport depends on media coverage. Television gave snooker a tremendous boost and the Tour could not do without such coverage since a spectator at the roadside can see no more than a few minutes of the race a day and needs papers to identify riders and television to understand the overall shape of the competition as it progresses. It was Channel 4 television that started to break down the ignorance of the British with regard to the Tour. Its daily coverage was so popular that it has had to go to repeats and moving the programme to prime time. In 1994 there was still no UK-sponsored team but the reputation of the Tour was considerably enhanced there when two of the stages of the Tour de France were raced in England, one from Dover to Brighton, and the other a circuit starting and ending in Portsmouth.

In 1994 the Tour attracted 149 000 visitors to Hampshire, generating an income of £8 million (for hotels, restaurants, pubs, cycling shops, £10-a-day car parks, etc.). Fifty-seven per cent of these visitors said they would definitely return to the area, making knock-on economic benefits look very promising. But for that prize the local authorities, as well as investing about half a mil-
lion pounds, had to accomplish a huge organisational feat. They began three years before the event. Technical officers, police officials and newspaper people visited the Tour in action in France several times. A Joint Authorities Panel of Hampshire and Portsmouth was set up; negotiations entered into with other authorities through whose districts the route would pass; and a central project team was formed to co-ordinate the three big events of the 1994 summer: Portsmouth’s 800-year celebrations, the D-Day anniversary and the Tour. The team comprised a project director and deputy, a co-ordinator, phone and desk receptionist, and commercial, advertising, hospitality, tourist, liaison, transport and associated events officers. A special booklet of instructions was produced for the thousand volunteer marshals who were organised into sectors with a supervisor for each section and a key marshal for every twenty or so volunteers. The project also galvanised a multitude of other groups such as the Southern Tourist Board, inter-county police committees and the Greater Portsmouth Hoteliers Association, whose particular job it was to provide hospitality for the visitors and who hit on the idea of representing, in their various hotels, food and drinks from various French regions. Businesses combined with local authorities to provide day-long festivities on village greens and in pubs and forecourts all along the race route.

The Tour entered the UK through the Channel Tunnel on 5 July and left on Brittany Ferries on 7 July after two days’ racing, ready to start again in Cherbourg on the morning of 8 July. However, Bernard Hinault would not have needed to complain: the weary riders travelled from Portsmouth to Cherbourg by plane.

Activity brief

1. The Hawthorne experiments suggested how groups can control their work tasks. How do racing cyclist teams illustrate such organisational behaviour?

2. On the basis of this account of the Tour, how far would it be true to say that a sporting group can provide its members with an outlet for high spirits, single-gender activities and even violent impulses that families, work and friends cannot? Does this idea help distinguish between the notion of team and group? How far do you think contemporary Western environments (television, feminism, private cars, etc.) might weaken the ‘club mentality’?

Introduction

In keeping with ‘the need for an international approach’, this case focuses on a major foreign sporting event. The 1994 visit to Britain by the Tour greatly accelerated the growing enthusiasm for, and understanding of, cycle racing by the British. This case should stimulate students’ interest and provide an organisation to study which is both accessible and fertile in terms of the numbers of different types of group it manifests, from the highly-trained cycling teams themselves right through to ad hoc groups of hoteliers or villagers banding together to provide a suitably festive welcome for the Tour in Britain.

Question 1

The Hawthorne experiments suggested how groups can control their work tasks. How do racing cyclist teams illustrate such organisational behaviour?

Clearly, there are significant differences between these teams and the groups identified in the bank wiring room: the teams are formally organised, working according to plans agreed with their managers, and with a legitimate leader; the workers at Western Electric are grouped informally, with leaders emerging naturally and pursuing unofficial aims. So, although the members of these two groups work together to control the task in hand (the cyclists nursing the leader through to success, the workers maintaining a comfortable working environment), the cyclists have economic gain higher up on the agenda than the workmen who focus more on social and
psychological objectives. Thus their respective attitudes, roles, structures and so on are all different too; the contrasts between Scientific Management and the Human Relations approach might be a helpful way of considering the differences. Nonetheless, the Leomond/Hinault dispute could be discussed in terms of rate-busting and squealing, perhaps.

**Question 2**
Sports groups as an outlet for needs not provided for in other kinds of groups.

This rather unwieldy clutch of questions does nevertheless indicate a continuum of related phenomena: sport > competition > teams > clubs.

It was Baden-Powell who famously described boxing as a way of discouraging masturbation in young boys, a hypothesis similar to Freud’s view of the dynamics of personality whereby drives may be sublimated, displaced or repressed. Everyone can find examples of these phenomena in their experience; Paul Kimmage ends his book with a very sad portrait of a cycling colleague for whom sport fulfilled needs to such an extent that when age forced retirement on him he turned to drink to compensate. Hopefully, then, students might think to employ their knowledge of Freud in answering this section.

Sporting groups become teams when they are carefully structured for efficiency. Where Belbin has Shapers, Plants and the like, cyclists have leaders, and *domestiques* (who may be differentiated between sprinters, climbers, etc., rather as in cricket there are bowlers, batsmen, wicket-keepers, etc.). But it is sport that allows controlled expression of drives rather than teams as such.

The speculation encouraged in the final question of the clutch really leaves the domain of organisational behaviour (unless perhaps answered in anthropological terms) by suggesting that Western societies are less community-centred than they have been: individuals have their own music centres they may render even more private by using headphones, private cars rather than trains and buses, telephones to talk to others without meeting, and so on. Such a long-term transformation would obviously affect organisations in the sense that any cultural change does.

The reference to feminism is even more speculative for it implies that, with greater equality, many male-dominated clubs may go into decline. Women have certainly formed their own football, cricket and rugby teams, and the Asian sports festivities that are a common sight in the English summer are still resolutely all-male affairs.

---

**Exercise: Build your own dinosaur!**

**Logistics**
The group should be divided into sub-groups of between four and eight. You will require a large picture of a dinosaur, which you will then need to ‘slice’ vertically so that each group can be provided with their own ‘slice’ that they have to build.

An observer should be appointed to each group who will give feedback to the group at the end of the exercise.

**Task**
Using the materials provided (and only those provided) each sub-group is required to construct their assigned section of the whole dinosaur which is

- recognisable as such;
- creative in use of materials;
- with the maximum dimensions of 18 inches from head to toe and 18 inches from head to tail.
Materials provided
Plasticine 2 sheets of A4 plain paper
2 sheets of newspaper Glue
String Drinking straws
Felt-tip pens Blueprint of dinosaur with only each particular
        sub-group’s section indicated

Time allowed
The total time allowed for this exercise is 40 minutes. At the end of this period each group will take their
part of the dinosaur to the co-ordinator and, while he or she is assembling the sections, sub-groups should
listen to and discuss their observer’s comments on their work.

Discussion points
Discussion can centre around the following areas:

● how small groups work together (or don’t);
● the need for communication, co-operation and communication between groups in order to get a task
  completed successfully; and
● in a whole group session, comparisons between the observers’ comments and the success or failure of
  the finished product (the whole dinosaur).

Exercise provided by Beverley Wallace, Gowrings (Newbury) Ltd.

Discussion points
Discussion can centre around the following areas:

● how small groups work together (or don’t);
● the need for communication, co-operation and communication between groups in order to get
  a task completed successfully.

Assignment
Working in a small group, elect an observer and then, starting with a brainstorming session, invent a board
game based on the Tour de France.

Present your game to the wider group. Each group will be judged by other groups using the following criteria:

● creativity;
● presentation of the game;
● interest likely to be engendered; and
● simplicity and ease of playing the game.

Have your observer report on the group’s functioning throughout the exercise, using theories such as
‘groupthink’, ‘risky-shift’, ‘interaction analysis’ and so on to help with the explanations.

This assignment could also be used as an integrative exercise in conjunction with a marketing
unit by looking at such issues as market research, positioning, packaging, pricing, distribution
channels, etc.

Applications and discussion
Application 1

Once upon a time a British company and a Japanese company decided to have a competitive boat
race on the river Thames. Both teams practised long and hard to reach their peak performance.
On the big day they were both as ready as they could be.
The Japanese won by a mile.

Afterwards the British team became very discouraged by their loss and morale plummeted. Senior management decided that the reason for the crushing defeat had to be found and a project team was set up to investigate the problem and recommend appropriate action.

Their conclusion: the Japanese team had eight people rowing and one person steering. The British team had one person rowing and eight people steering. Senior management hired a consultancy company to do a study on the team structure. Millions of pounds and several months later, the consultancy company concluded that too many people were steering and not enough were rowing.

To prevent another loss to the Japanese the following year, the team structure was changed to: four steering managers, three senior steering managers and one executive steering manager. A new performance system was set up for the person rowing the boat to give more incentive to work harder and become a key performer. ‘We must get it right first time, every time’ the British were heard to say.

The next year the Japanese won by two miles. The British company made the rower redundant for poor performance, sold off all the paddles, cancelled all capital investment for new equipment, halted development of a new boat, awarded high performance awards to the consultants, and distributed the money saved to senior executives . . . .

Application 2

Think back to your first day at college (and some of us have to think back further than others). It’s 9.15, you’re all in the lecture theatre and the course manager is about to do the ‘welcome to the course and have a great time’ bit. You listen with one ear and glance nervously around at the people who’ll be your companions over the next three or four years. These are the people you’ll work with, get drunk with, go out with and perhaps live with (although not necessarily in that order). Surprise, surprise! They’re all wearing the same type of clothes: jeans which are just sufficiently worn out to be acceptable and a slightly faded sweatshirt (ideally either advertising a rock band’s tour from about two years ago or, failing that, a brand of real ale). Then you notice a lone soul sitting in the corner in brand new jeans (with a crease up the centre) and a brand new chain store sweatshirt. They look totally out of it and you decide to give them a wide berth: definitely an oddity, that one. Still, the rest look OK.

What has happened here is that you’ve all been through the process of anticipatory socialisation: you want to be accepted by the group in general and so you start by wearing the sort of clothes which will immediately identify you with that group. Luckily for you, you got it right. Unluckily for the other one, they had the right idea but got it ever so slightly wrong.

(If you want a further example of anticipatory socialisation/group norms, remember back to the same period but a little later into your college life when the groups had began to form and courses and faculties began to differentiate themselves: the pharmacists always drank more than anyone else; the engineers always wore leather jackets; the computer boffins were altogether different (you know what we mean . . . ).

Application 3

Kirk’s team saves the world (again . . .)

Captain’s log: Stardate 8454.2

My senior officers and I have taken command of the new USS Enterprise, after six charges against us were dismissed by a Starfleet Federation Court Martial. The court was swayed in our
favour because we had recently saved Earth from the depredations of an immense, intergalactic hump-backed whale, armed as we were with nothing more than a clapped-out Klingon bird of prey and Scotty's recipe for transparent aluminium.

This has prompted me to reflect on the qualities which enable my crew and me to function so successfully as a team and have found the writings of a twentieth-century management author, Dr. R. Meredith Belbin, most interesting in this context (as Spock would say). I therefore asked the ship's computer to undertake an analysis of our respective team roles using the Belbin model.

Science Officer Spock's sober logic, his capacity for accurate data-based analysis and his habit of making decisions only when he has fully evaluated all possible options mark him out as a monitor-evaluator in Belbin's typology. His somewhat clinical judgements mean, however, that he does not make an inspiring leader and his openly expressed criticism frequently causes him to clash with the ship's doctor.

Dr McCoy's outspoken and often argumentative cynicism makes him a prickly, but highly expert, individualist. He is quick to challenge and frequently expresses himself in a provocative, colourful, even hurtful manner. His courage, often born of outrage at stupidity or petty bureaucracy, is also typical of the shaper's team role.

Communications Officer Uhura is a popular and friendly crew member; frequently confidante to Scott, Chekov and Sulu, and able to smooth over tensions and conflicts between senior officers. An accomplished singer and musician, she is always ready to entertain her colleagues during off-duty moments and this indicates her role as the sociable team worker.

Chief Engineer Scott is our specialist. Devoted to his dilythium-powered engines and knowing every inch of the Enterprise like the back of his hand, he is typically single-minded and dedicated, though sometimes too preoccupied with technicalities to bother with overall mission objectives.

Our extrovert Helmsman, Mr Sulu, is outward-looking, open to new ideas and experiences, though some of his enthusiasms are short lived. He shows many characteristics of the resource investigator.

Navigator Chekov is destined for Starship command. As a conscientious all-rounder, he is meticulous to the point of obsession, rarely leaving any task unfinished. He appears to be a completer.

As for myself, James T. Kirk, the computer indicates that my maturity and confidence, combined with my capacity to optimise the talents of others, make me a co-ordinator. However, it seems that I also exhibit the unorthodox and creative problem-solving tendencies of the plant which have led me into more than one clash with Starfleet Command.

We are receiving news of a hostage crisis on Nimbus III; can Belbin's Team Theory save the world once more? Ahead Warp Factor 5, Mr Sulu, and steady as she goes.

Provided by Gill Norris, University of Portsmouth.
Multiple-choice questions

1. **(Chapter 14, p. 496)** Belbin concludes that the most consistently successful groups:

   (a) are those in which all members are highly intelligent  
   (b)* comprise a range of roles undertaken by various members  
   (c) are those in which all members are creative  
   (d) comprise a range of roles all undertaken by few members of the group

2. **(Chapter 14, p. 496)** The team role that a person undertakes in a group is:

   (a) not fixed and may change according to circumstances  
   (b) different to a person's functional role within the same group  
   (c)* both (a) and (b)  
   (d) neither (a) nor (b)

3. **(Chapter 14, p. 501)** When monitoring the general satisfaction of members of groups, researchers such as Leavitt have found that satisfaction for all members is high when:

   (a)* there is a greater interconnectedness of the network  
   (b) there is a high level of dependence on other members within the group  
   (c) the group does not establish its own communication network  
   (d) all of the above

4. **(Chapter 14, p. 503)** When studying behaviour in groups, there are many methods which may be used to help understand the roles and relationships within the group. They include:

   (a) sociometry  
   (b) interaction analysis  
   (c) observation charting  
   (d)* all of the above

5. **(Chapter 14, p. 508)** Groups are an essential feature of an organisation. The advantages of working in groups include:

   (a) commitment by members to decisions made and their implementation  
   (b) the provocation of future ideas and thoughts in the minds of others  
   (c)* both (a) and (b)  
   (d) neither (a) nor (b)

6. **(Chapter 14, p. 516)** A simple framework which is used frequently to help individuals in sensitivity training is the Johari Window. The aim is to reduce the individual’s _______ and ________ behaviour through feedback from others.

   (a) public and blind  
   (b)* hidden and blind  
   (c) unknown and public  
   (d) hidden and unknown