Can team development be a way to strengthen employees' well-being?

- team development and well-being across time
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Earlier research on Groups and Health or well-being

Most studies on Group development and different correlates focuses on **group performance**.

For instance, teams that has reached higher stages of development according to GDQ has for instance shown:

– To have higher performing students in schools (Wheelan & Kesselring, 2005)

– To have more surviving patients in intensive care units (Wheelan, Burchill & Tillin, 2003)
Earlier research on Groups and Health

Kivimäki and colleagues (Kivimäki et al., 2001; Kivimäki et al., 2007) regarding team work and health among health care workers.

- Their studies have showed that poor team climate is associated with depressive disorders in a nationally representative sample and sickness absenteeism of hospital physicians.

Jacobsson and colleagues (Jacobsson et al., 2014; Jacobsson et al., 2016).

- Their studies have showed that poor team climate is associated with emotional exhaustion, stress-reactions, low levels of work satisfaction and a tendency of high levels of short-time sick leave.
Research questions

The teams were measured before and after intervention with respect to how effectively they cooperated and how they perceived their job satisfaction, levels of stress and emotional exhaustion. The research questions were:

1. To what extent did the teams develop over time towards more effective cooperation?
2. To what extent did team members’ health and well-being change?
3. Was stability of membership in the teams a factor in this context?
Measures

Group Development
Group Development Questionnaire, GDQ, (Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996) was used for assessing group development or maturity of the groups. On the basis of the IMGD, the 60-item GDQ contains four scales that correspond to the first four stages of group development. Each scale contains 15 items and each item has a Lickert type response scale from 1 to 5, were 1 is never true of this group and 5 is always true of this group. Therefore, the minimum score on each scale is 15 and the maximum score is 75. This study was conducted with the Swedish translation of GDQ, GDQ SE3, which is the third revised version. Psychometrical properties (Cronbach’s alpha) for GDQ SE3 scale I is 0.77, for scale II, III and IV the values are 0.90, 0.81 and 0.87 respectively (C. Jacobsson & Persson, 2011).

Emotional exhaustion and Perceived Stress
Emotional exhaustion was measured by means of Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, Subscale Personal Burnout (Kristensen, Borritz, Villadsen, & Christensen, 2005). However, after having a response-psychological test panel using the scale it was reduced from 6 to 5 items (C Jacobsson & Pousette, 2012). Sample items are “How often do you feel tired?” and “How often are you emotionally exhausted?”, the scale goes from 1 (never) to 5 (always) and Cronbach’s alpha was 0.88.

Perceived stress was measured by a single item starting with a definition of the phenomena (being restless, tense, nervous etc.), following by a question if the respondent felt any of this. the scale goes from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much).

Work satisfaction
Work satisfaction was measured with a three-item scale of overall job satisfaction (Wanous & Lawler, 1972), used in an earlier study by Jacobsson and Pousette (2012). Sample items are “based on an overall assessment, how satisfied are you with your current work situation” and “How well do your company meet your expectations for how you want it in your work?”. The scale goes from 1 (not at all) to 10 (to the highest degree), Cronbach’s alpha was 0.91.
The Malmö, Rosengård, Project

• A project financed by ESF, European Union.
• Running time, August 2011 to June 2013
• 118 groups in schools and pre-schools, divided into two halves, first half (51 groups) year one and second the next year.
• Approx. 900 teachers
• 7 psychologists consulting the 118 groups, one project leader, Elisabet Graci.
• External experts supervising internal consultants and working with the management teams
The Design of the Project; Time and Organizational Level

- Top management team
- Management team 1
- Management team 2
- Management team 3
- Teacher team
- Teacher team
- Teacher team
- External experts
- Internal experts (7 psychologists)
The design of the project, Process

**Knowledge:**
One lecture on Group Psychology

**GDQ 1***:
GDQ-Diagnosis

**Group development Interventions**:

**GDQ 2**
GDQ-Diagnosis

* GDQ and Health related measures (Stress, Work satisfaction ...)

** Survey feedback on GDQ, action plan, Shared mental models by means of the Goal Matrix.

About 6 – 7 month
A group’s development according to IMGD (GDQ) (Wheelan)

I. Dependency and Inclusion
II. Counterdependency and Fight
III. Trust and Structure
IV. Work and Productivity

The leader and the relations are in focus

The tasks are in focus
108 groups, time 1, HT 11 & HT12

Normerade skalor för I – IV: Procent av grupper i svenska normdata (SE 3, N = 357 grupper) som ligger under respektive medelvärde (skalan = 15 – 75) (Jacobsson, C) - 20 dec, 2011
108 groups, time 1 (HT11 & HT12) and time 2 (VT12 & VT13)

Normerade skalar för I – IV: Procent av grupper i svenska normdata (SE 3, N = 357 grupper) som ligger under respektive medelvärde (skalan = 15 – 75) (Jacobsson, C) - dec, 2011

* = signifikant skillnad P< 0.05
Research question 1

• All together, the results indicates that the groups in the schools and pre-schools were more developed than normal Swedish groups and also that they developed across time with regard to two of four GDQ scales. They felt more included (stage 1) and levels of conflicts decreased (stage 2).
Research question 2

• To what extent did team members’ health and well-being change?

• - No change!
Research question 3

• Was stability of membership in the teams a factor in this context?

• One third of the groups in year two were affected by structural changes. These groups were split in half's, merged or were soon to be dissolved

• Did this influence the results?
**Before consultation:** year 2: 38 groups with unchanged structure\(^1\)

compared to 19 groups with changed structure **time 1**

Normerade skalor för I – IV: Procent av grupper i svenska normdata \((SE 3, N = 357 grupper)\) som ligger under respektive medelvärde (skalan = 15 – 75) \((Jacobsson, C) -\ dec, 2011\)

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
\text{Max. värde} & 51,8 & 61,7 & 68,8 & 69,3 \\
\hline
\text{Medelvärde} & 43,1 & 43,5 & 59,7 & 61,6 \\
\hline
\text{Min. värde} & 21,5 & 18,7 & 30,0 & 30,0
\end{array}\]

\(\alpha = p<.10; *=P<0.05; **=P<0.01\)

\(^1\) Förändrad struktur = grupperna har splittrats, slagits samman, har förestående nedläggning el. dyl.
After consultation: year 2: 38 groups with unchanged structure 1) compared to 19 groups with changed structure time 2

Normerade skalor för I – IV: Procent av grupper i svenska normdata (SE 3, N = 357 grupper) som ligger under respektive medelvärde (skalan = 15 – 75) (Jacobsson, C - dec, 2011)

1) Förändrad struktur = grupperna har splittrats, slagits samman, har förestående nedläggning el. dyl.
Research question 3 – membership stability

- The stable groups developed across time and the unstable groups regressed. Which influence the results on well-being...
## Changes in health in stable and unstable groups

### Stable groups, n=38 groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well-being</th>
<th>Mean value before team development</th>
<th>Mean value after team development</th>
<th>Difference?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Tendency, P&lt;0.10. F(1,37)=1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work satisfaction</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Yes, P&lt;0.05. F(1,37)=2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unstable groups, n=19 groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well-being</th>
<th>Mean value before team development</th>
<th>Mean value after team development</th>
<th>Difference?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work satisfaction</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Yes, P&lt;0.01 F(1,18)=3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

Research question 1.
• The groups did develop to some extent across time.

Research question 2.
• No differences on well-being among team members across time among 108 groups

Research question 3.
• However, analyzing stable and unstable (structure) groups separately...
  – In the stable groups, the emotional exhaustion had a tendency to decrease and work satisfaction increased across time.
  – In the unstable groups levels of work satisfaction decreased.
3. An Intervention Model in Use; The Goal Matrix

Examples of an intervention model used in the project.

The goal matrix. – enhancing shared mental models in the team
**Goal-taxonomy for work groups** – Purpose, members, stakeholders and goals of the group  
(Christian Jacobsson)

**A. The purpose of the group is:** ....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Space</strong></th>
<th><strong>Time</strong></th>
<th><strong>Process goals – Now/all the time</strong></th>
<th><strong>Future results – Later</strong></th>
<th><strong>Visions – Maybe later</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**B. Internal focus:**

Who are members & what role do they have?

1. *Internal standards*
2. *External standards*
3. *Developmental goals*
4. *Operative goals*
5. *Guiding stars*
6. *Vision*

**C. External focus:**

Who has an interest in our work/for whom do we work?

Example from a management team, 6 members, education/labor market

A. **The purpose of the group is:** Together lead, coordinate and develop the operations/business as a whole, being a link between strategic and operative level that gives structure and focus on the common questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Process goals – Now/all the time</th>
<th>Future results – Later</th>
<th>Visions – Maybe later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B. Internal focus: 1 general manager 3 department managers 2 support functions | | 1. **Internal standards**  
- Meeting discipline …  
- Follow the issues on the road – make sure they don’t come back to us  
- Help each other to be role models in our leadership | 3. **Developmental goals**  
- Increase the knowledge of each other and each part of the whole  
- Use the existing structure more, such as sort were matters belong | 5. **Guiding stars**  
- Goal focused  
- Innovative  
- Challenging |
| C. External focus: We work on behalf of politicians for the benefit of residents in general, but especially students, staff and collab. partners | 2. **External standards**  
- Development and results oriented  
- Have a good treatment  
- Collaboration oriented  
- Being present  
- … | 4. **Operative goals**  
- Secure that the implementation plan is implemented  
- Clarify how the following will be implemented  
- Marketing  
- Empowerment/Med-arbetarskap | 6. **Vision**  
- We are a leader in meeting future skills needs in a lifelong perspective |
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