Increasing Teacher Team Effectiveness by Evidence Based Consulting

Christian Jacobsson, University of Gothenburg & Sentensio
Maria Wramsten Wilmar, University of Gothenburg & Right Management
Contact: christian.jacobsson@psy.gu.se

Presented at:
14th European Congress of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP)
at Santiago Compostela, Spain, 13-16 may, 2009
The Integrated Model and GDQ

Group Development Questionnaire, GDQ, is a questionnaire that operationalize the Integrated Model of Group Development

GDQ has been systematically reviewed and has gained a substantial body of supporting evidence for its validity concerning the productivity and effectiveness of what teams accomplish (Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996)

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 a more lean production in the financial and service sector (Wheelan, 1994)
- To have more surviving patients in intensive care units (Wheelan, Burchill & Tillin, 2003)
The Integrated Model of Group Development

I. Dependency and Inclusion
- Member dependency on the leader
- Tendency to be tentative and polite
- Few if any challenges to leader or other members
- Independent action is rare
- Work occurs but at low levels

II. Counterdependency and Fight
- Characterized by conflict among members and between members and leaders
- Struggle with role definition and goals
- Coalitions form among members sharing similar ideas and values
- First steps to create structure for the group and role clarification

III. Trust and Structure
- There is trust among members and the leader
- A mature process about deciding group goals, structure and procedures
- Information is shared rather than used for power struggles
- The groundwork for group function is laid while relationships are strengthened

IV. Work and Productivity
- Effective work begins as an idea and ends with a product
- Communication on ideas and information is open between all members
- Work occurs in a time bound frame
- Group members use all available resources, to complete the task
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Research

An earlier Meta-analysis (Salas, Rozell, Mullen & Driskell, 1999) suggests that team building methods in general has a somewhat random effect on team effectiveness.

A Recent Meta-analysis (Klein, DiazGranados, Salas, Le, Burke, Lyons & Goodwin, 2009), suggests however that team-building that focuses on goal setting and role clarification do have an effect on team performance, however a moderate one. The largest effect is in large groups (n>10 members).

GDQ-based interventions also seem to have a systematic effect according to a study with control and experiment groups (Buzaglo & Wheelan, 1999). GDQ based interventions usually contains goal setting and role clarification, but also leader dependency issues, trust, communication and feedback.
Research question:

*To what extent does GDQ-based team development result in more effective teams?*
The Teacher Teams

- The consulting project involved 35 Teacher teams in two senior high schools.

- The teams were given process consultation for approx. 1 year by GDQ-certified consultants. There were 7 consultants working with the teams.

- All the teams were offered support from a consultant and started the team development, but 7 of the 35 teams did not carry out the project as intended. 2 of them were stage IV groups.
The Consultation Process

- All the groups had a budget of 20 hours of consultation each, plus a GDQ-measurement before and after the project. The average amount of meetings during the project was 6–8, and meeting time was 2–3 hours.

- The consultation starting and ended with a GDQ-survey. At the start the team was invited to take part in identifying its own growth needs and make an action plan.

- Further on, process consultation was given with the purpose to support and strengthen the teams' ability to cooperate effectively.

- Examples of focal areas was goal-setting, role clarification, decision-making, functional sub-grouping, leadership issues.
The design of the project

**Knowledge:**
3 x Seminars on Group Psychology

**Diagnosis:**
Meeting with the head-master
GDQ-Diagnosis of the faculty group (35 groups.)

**Development:**
GDQ-based group development
GDQ-based group development
GDQ-based group development
GDQ-based group development
GDQ-Diagnosis of the faculty group (35 groups.)

**Diagnosis:**
Evaluation meeting with the head-master

---
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## EDUCATION TEAMS: % IN EACH STAGE, US
(Susan Wheelan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE I</th>
<th>STAGE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(46.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 3</td>
<td>STAGE 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(53.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TEACHER TEAMS: % IN EACH STAGE

28 teams (35 teams at baseline), pre-test to Team Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE I</th>
<th>STAGE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>28,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25,7)</td>
<td>(25,7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 1 & 2 = 53,6 (51,4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 3</th>
<th>STAGE 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35,7</td>
<td>10,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34,3)</td>
<td>(14,3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 3 & 4 = 46,4 (48,6)
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Teacher Teams Pre-test and *Post-test* to Team Development - Percentage of teams in each stage

Classified according to Wheelan (1994), n = 28 teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE I</th>
<th>STAGE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>28,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 1 & 2 = 53,6 – 25,0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 3</th>
<th>STAGE 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35,7</td>
<td>10,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39,0</td>
<td>36,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 3 & 4 = 46,4 – 75,0
## 28 Swedish Education Teams
Before and After Team Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE POST</th>
<th>STAGE I</th>
<th>STAGE II</th>
<th>STAGE III</th>
<th>STAGE IV</th>
<th>SUM POST-TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE I</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE II</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE III</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM PRE-TEST</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Team Development:
Progression, Stagnation or Regression?

Among the 28 teams, the following results was observed when comparing GDQ stages before and after team development:

- 7 teams did not develop as intended, they were in the same stage as before. Together with the 3 stage IV teams, it was 10 teams.

- 2 teams moved in the wrong direction, both from stage III to stage II!

- 16 teams did develop, 10 of them made a jump to the next stage, 4 of them moved two stages and 2 of them moved three stages.
GDQ Scales: Pre- and Post-test
Mean values, n = 28 Swedish Teacher Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GDQ Scale</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDQ Scale 1</td>
<td>42,2</td>
<td>38,5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDQ Scale 2</td>
<td>39,4</td>
<td>35,0***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDQ Scale 3</td>
<td>51,2</td>
<td>53,8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDQ Scale 4</td>
<td>53,3</td>
<td>55,9**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scale is from 15 to 75; ** = p<0.01; *** p<0.001
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Mean Values on GDQ Scales, 28 Teacher Teams Compared to Norm Data for Swedish Teams (n = 101 teams) — Before and After Intervention
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