# The Build and Bond Experiential Exercise: Utilizing Teams and Team Concepts to Create and Execute a Virtual Team Building Activity

# Abstract

This article shares information about a Build and Bond Exercise, which is designed to foster team member bonds and introduce team members to the concepts of team processes, task interdependence, creativity, groupthink, and nominal group technique.

Instructors provide foundational knowledge and warm-up activities, leading into the experiential exercise. Students engage in small-group team discussions to make effective decisions, establish appropriate team processes, and develop detailed implementation plans. In all-class discussions, teams showcase their virtual team building activities and reflect on how learning can be applied in future team experiences within business curriculums or in organization settings.

This experiential exercise can be used in any undergraduate or graduate course in a variety of disciplines.
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Have you ever noticed a student sigh or shift uncomfortably at the mention of a team project? Students commonly express discomfort and complain about barriers associated with team projects. Some of these complaints pertain to team member value differences, communication issues, unmotivated peers, team member performance, fear of criticism, process issues, or lack of direction (Holmer, 2001; Feichtner & Davis, 1985; Feichtner & Davis, 2016). Although many teams struggle to accomplish goals, organizations are regularly utilizing teams to perform tasks (Klang & Luria, 2020; Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008). Therefore, undergraduate, and graduate business students are often required to learn team concepts and skills as they prepare for their professional lives.

Management classes are typically the venue for learning about teams and the importance of developing interpersonal relationships. However, it can be difficult for instructors to find comprehensive tools designed with the intention of developing team member friendships while simultaneously completing team projects.

The Build and Bond Exercise is a comprehensive tool, which addresses this disconnect and allows students to learn concepts related to teams, apply strategies designed for generating creative ideas, develop effective team processes, avoid team failures, create and implement virtual team building activities, establish team member bonds, and reflect on ways to apply learning to more advanced courses. The Build and Bond exercise can be used in face-to-face, virtual/online, and hybrid course formats.

# Theoretical Foundation

## Team Building and Team Member Friendships

One way to help students develop team skills and produce high performance is to foster friendships among team members (Chung, Lount, Park, & Park, 2018; Klang & Luria, 2020). Teammates who form friendships create relational bonds and are more likely to experience positive interpersonal experiences and higher levels of team effectiveness (Klang & Luria, 2020). They regularly choose to spend time together beyond required meetings (Sias & Cahill, 1998). Indeed, friendships and emotional bonds among team members seem to be an instrumental factor in team learning and performance (Dimas et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020).

Team building activities can foster emotional bonds among team members while also teaching students how to successfully work in teams. Research suggests that team building activities often have positive impacts on students’ perceptions of working in teams (Gordon et al., 2019). Properly designed team building activities can help improve trust, communication, and coordination among team members (Klein et al., 2009). These activities can also improve team performance and knowledge of team competencies (Klein et al., 2009). Team building activities should include one or more of the following four approaches: goal setting, developing relations, clarifying roles, and problem solving (see also Klein, et al., 2009). The Build and Bond exercise is developed to incorporate all four approaches.

## Student Project Team Effectiveness

Holmer (2001) outlined eight strategies to help improve student project team effectiveness: 1) explain team dynamics, 2) introduce the dangers of risk avoidance, 3) emphasize learning, 4) teach assertive communication 5) develop and abide by team norms, 6) provide written feedback, 7) debrief, and 8) coach. The steps of the Build and Bond exercise, as well as the preparation and readiness work, incorporate these strategies.

# Learning Objectives

After completing this exercise, students can do the following:

* + Apply team concepts to develop and maintain an effective team process
  + Create a virtual team building activity within a team
  + Execute an effective virtual team building activity
  + Become an effective self-managed team
  + Establish emotional bonds and friendships
  + Identify ways to reduce groupthink

# Exercise Overview - Running the Build and Bond Exercise

Working in teams, students select, develop, and execute a team-building activity for their team. Detailed step-by-step instructions can be found in Appendix A.

## Logistics

*Preparation*. Foundational knowledge and warm-up activity (see Appendix B for more information).

*Materials needed*.

* Access to team collaboration tool

*Team size*. Approximately 5 students per team

*Timing*. Six hours over 3-4 weeks, towards the beginning or middle of the semester, after students have gotten to know each other through other class discussions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **When & Where** | **How Long** |
| 1. Foundational Knowledge Discussion | 1 week prior to exercise; in class | 15 – 20 minutes |
| 1. Warm-up Activities | 1 week prior to exercise; in class | 45 – 55 minutes |
| 1. Select/Form Teams | Week of exercise |  |
| 1. Develop team collaboration process | In team collaboration space | 40 – 60 minutes |
| 1. Generate ideas and select the virtual team building activity | In team collaboration space | 30 – 60 minutes |
| 1. Execute the virtual team building activity | In team collaboration space | 60 minutes |
| 1. Reflect on the virtual team building activity | 1 week following exercise; in class | 30 – 60 minutes |
| 1. Debrief | 1 week following exercise; in class | 60 minutes |

**Session Description**

In this 60-minute activity/exercise, we will introduce the enjoyable Build and Bond activity, talk through the steps involved, simulate a student team participating in the experience, and allow time for suggestions and adaptations. In addition, we will be providing attendees useful handouts for running their own “Build and Bond” exercise. Our structured discussion at the end will explore additional ideas that foster teamwork and creativity.

Timeline

* 7 minutes - Introduction to the goals and objectives of the Build and Bond activity
* 10 minutes - Discuss guidelines and steps of the activity empathizing how to meet objectives
* 8 minutes - Answer questions and explore ideas for adaptations.
* 10 minutes - Simulation of a student team’s involvement in the activity.
* 10 minutes - Provide handouts (our appendices) and discuss how to use them.
* 15 minutes – Q&A and group exploration of OB concepts to introduce in the activity

# Debriefing

Begin the debriefing with students sharing a description of their virtual team building activity and how the activity added value to their team. If time allows, we allow students to organize their thoughts and feelings within their team for a few minutes before sharing with the class. Typically, students discuss how they were able to get to know their team members better or become more comfortable asking their team members questions. They may also explain that they learned how to organize team projects better, establish team roles and responsibilities, and reduce groupthink. Some students might also reflect on the reasons why previous team experiences were of less value. If these answers do not surface naturally, the instructor may want to probe for more detail and reflection from the student teams.

The purpose of the last portion of the debrief is to provide students with an opportunity to connect their learning to future team experiences. This is especially important if team skills are expected to be applied in more advanced courses. Conclude by reiterating that the learning process is ongoing.

# Conclusion

While teams are utilized within organizations and business courses, many students and instructors often focus on the team tasks and underestimate the role that relationship building can play in producing team outputs. The Build and Bond exercise exposes teams to issues of creativity, team struggles, and team processes. This exercise often fosters team member friendships and gives students a better grasp of team skills. The exercise also lends itself well to engaging in discussions about a more comfortable classroom environment. It can be used in face-to-face virtual/online or hybrid class formats.

# References

Armstrong, A. (1999). Teaching creativity: An“EEE” experiential exercise. *Journal of Management Education, 23*(2), 174-179. https://doi.org/10.1177/105256299902300206

Benne, K. D., & Sheats, P. (1948). Functional roles of group members. *Journal of Social Issues*, *4*, 41-49. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1948.tb01783.x

Chung, S., Lount, R. B., Jr., Park, H. M., & Park, E. S. (2018). Friends with performance benefits: A meta-analysis on the relationship between friendship and group performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *44*(1), 63-79. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217733069

Colquitt, J., LePine, J. & Wesson, M. (2018). *Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Courtright, S. H., Thurgood, G. R., Stewart, G. L., & Pierotti, A. J. (2015). Structural interdependence in teams: An integrative framework and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*, 1825-1846. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000027

Crowne, K. A. (2019). Puzzling in teams: A multipurpose group activity for teamwork, communication, problem solving, and creativity. *Management Teaching Review*, *4*(4), 306-316. https://doi.org/10.1177/2379298118820786

Delbecq, A. L., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1971). A group process model for problem identification and program planning. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *7*, 466-492. https://doi.org/10.1177/002188637100700404

Dimas, I. D., Lourenço, P. R., Rebelo, T., & Rocha, H. (2020). Maximizing learning through cohesion: Contributions from a nonlinear approach. *Small Group Research*, https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496420944488

Dyer W., Dyer G., & Dyer, W. (2013). *Team building: Proven strategies for improving team performance*. Jossey-Bass.

Feichtner, S., & Davis, E. (1985). Why some groups fail: Survey of students’ experiences with learning groups. *Organizational Behavior Teaching Review*, *9*(4), 58-73. https://doi.org/10.1177/105256298400900409

Festinger, L. (1950). Informal social communication. *Psychological Review*, *57*, 271-282. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0056932

Fiechtner, S. B., & Davis, E. A. (2016). Republication of “Why some groups fail: A survey of students experiences with learning groups." *Journal of Management Education*, *40*(1), 12–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/105256298400900409

Gersick, C. J. (1988). Time and transition in work teams: Toward a new model of group development. *Academy of Management Journal*, *31*, 9-41. https://doi.org/10.2307/256496

Gordon, S. K., Trovinger, S., & DeLellis, T. (2019). Escape from the usual: Development and implementation of an ‘escape room’ activity to assess team dynamics. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, *11*(8), 818-824. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2019.04.013

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

Handke, L., Klonek, F. E., Parker, S. K., & Kauffeld, S. (2020). Interactive effects of team virtuality and work design on team functioning. *Small Group Research*, *51*(1), 3-47. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496419863490

Holmer, L. L. (2001). Will we teach leadership or skilled incompetence? The challenge of student project teams. *Journal of Management Education,* *25*(5), 590-605. https://doi.org/10.1177/105256290102500509

Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of groupthink: A psychological study of foreign-policy decisions and fiascoes*. Houghton Mifflin.

Keiser, J. D. (2020). Using *The New Yorker* magazine’s cartoon caption contest to stimulate creative group problem solving: An in-class exercise. *Management Teaching Review*, https://doi.org/10.1177/2379298120909095

Klang, M., & Luria, G. (2020). Group bonding and effectiveness: Cohesion’s moderating role and leaders’ relationship mediating role. *Small Group Research*, https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496420977915

Klein, C., DiazGranados, D., Salas, E., Le, H., Burke, C. S., Lyons, R., & Goodwin, G. F. (2009). Does team building work? *Small Group Research*, *40*(2), 181-222. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496408328821

Klimoski, R., & Mohammed, S. (1994). Team mental model: Construct or metaphor? *Journal of Management*, *20*, 403-437. https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-2063(94)90021-3

Latané, B., Williams, K., & Harkins, S. (1979). Many hands make light the work: The causes and consequences of social loafing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 822-832. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.6.822

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. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.5.803

Mathieu, J. E., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, *34*(3), 410–476. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316061

Michaelsen, L. K., & Sweet, M. (2008). The essential elements of team‐based learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2008*(116), 7-27. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.330

Osborn, A. F. (1953). *Applied imagination* (revised ed.). Scribner.

Peeters, M. A., Van Tuijl, H. F., Rutte, C. G., & Reymen, I. M. (2006). Personality and team performance: A meta‐analysis. *European Journal of Personality*, *20*, 377-396. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.588

Rusticus, S. A., & Justus, B. J. (2019). Comparing student-and teacher-formed teams on group dynamics, satisfaction, and performance. *Small Group Research*, *50*(4), 443-457. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/1046496419854520

Schmutz, J., Meir, L., & Manser, T. (2019). “How effective is teamwork really? The relationship between teamwork and performance in healthcare teams: A systematic review and meta-analysis.” *BMJ Open, 9*(9), https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028280

Senge, P. (1990a). *The fifth discipline: The art and management of the learning organization*. Doubleday.

Shea, G. P., & Guzzo, R. A. (1987). Groups as human resources. In G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol. 5, pp. 323-356). JAI Press.

Sias, P. M., Tsetsi, E., Woo, N., & Smith, A. D. (2020). With a little help from my friends: Perceived task interdependence, coworker communication, and workplace friendship. *Communication Studies*, *71*(4), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2020.1749863

Sias, P. M., & Cahill, D. J. (1998). From coworkers to friends: The development of peer friendships in the workplace. *Western Journal of Communication*, *62*(3), 273–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570319809374611

Stewart, G. L. (2006). A meta-analytic review of relationships between team design features and team performance. *Journal of Management*, *32*, 29-55. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305277792

Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory.* McGraw-Hill.

Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, *63*, 384-399. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0022100

Van de Ven, A. H., Delbecq, A. L., & Koenig, R., Jr. (1976). Determinants of coordination modes within organizations. *American Sociological Review, 41*, 322-338. https://doi.org/10.2307/2094477

Wegner, D. M. (1987). Transactive memory: A contemporary analysis of the group mind. In B. Mullen, & G. R. Goethals (Eds.), *Theories of group behavior. Springer series in social psychology* (pp.185-208). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-4634-3\_9

Williams, K., & O’Reilly, C. (1998). The complexity of diversity: A review of forty years of research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *21*, 77-140.

Zhang, H. H., Ding, C., Schutte, N. S., & Li, R. (2020). How team emotional intelligence connects to task performance: A network approach. *Small Group Research*, *51*(4), 492-516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496419889660>

**Appendix A**

**Build and Bond Exercise: Step-by-Step Instructions**

## Step-by-Step Instructions

*Step 1. Preparation*: *Foundational Knowledge Discussion (15-20 minutes)*

About one week before beginning the exercise, discuss team concepts such as the strengths and weaknesses of teams. Introduce team dynamics and common problems that might arise in teams. Define team roles to prepare students to engage in the exercise. Discuss how risk avoidance can impede team performance and the types of task interdependencies, emphasizing that pooled interdependence (merging individual efforts), inhibits team performance. See Appendix B for team concepts and related discussion questions.

*Step 2. Preparation: Warm-up Activities* *(45-55 minutes)*

Discuss groupthink, the pros and cons of brainstorming and group nominal techniques and allow students to experiment with these techniques. Try a warm-up word games that gets students to laugh and share positive emotional experiences with each other. By exposing students to a solid foundation of team concepts and allowing them time to practice concepts during warm-up activities, you prepare them to participate in the exercise. See Appendix B for methods of developing a creative mindset.

*Step 3. Build & Bond: Select/Form Teams*.

Teams can be student-formed teams or instructor-formed teams. Instructor-formed teams can be especially useful for fostering interpersonal relationships. They tend to be the recommended method because they simulate real-world scenarios and promote diversity (Rusticus & Justus, 2019).

Be sure to also consider team size. The Build and Bond Exercise is designed for any size team. Research suggests that regardless of team size, team building interventions can improve a variety of performance and team outcomes (Klein, DiazGranados, Salas, Le, Burke, Lyons, Goodwin, 2009). Interestingly, team building interventions tend to have an especially profound impact on larger teams with more than ten members (Klein, et al., 2009). However, it is important to note that student teams tend to be most satisfied when working in smaller team sizes (Dyer W., Dyer G., and Dyer, W. 2013; Schmutz, J., Meir, L., and Manser, T., 2019).

*Step 4. Build & Bond: Develop Team Collaboration Process* *(40 – 60 minutes)*

Have students apply team content and develop their own team collaboration process. Remind students that you do not want them to discuss virtual team-building activity ideas yet. The goal during Step 1 is to develop the process that will be used (e.g., group nominal technique) to generate creative ideas in the next step. Assign or have students identify a group collaboration tool.

Have students submit a short deliverable determined (e.g., short document, discussion post, video, flip grid, etc.) that discusses how the team will generate several creative ideas. The team should also identify the collaboration tools they plan to use, identify their goal interdependence and outcome interdependence. This deliverable should also include a description of the process (e.g., group nominal technique, brainwriting, etc.) they will use to minimize groupthink. The deliverable should also outline the responsibilities of each team member, team norms and behavioral expectations, as well as team member roles. See Appendix C for a student recording document.

Follow Holmer (2001)’s student team effectiveness strategy and provide feedback for the Step 1 deliverable before allowing teams to move on to Step 2.

*Step 5. Build & Bond: Generate Ideas and Select the Virtual Team Building Activity (30-60 minutes*

Students collaborate with team members and implement the process identified in the prior step. Give students time to discuss and analyze their process ideas. Using the process students choose, they select or develop one idea and create a virtual team-building activity implementation plan.

The deliverable during Step 2 should include a detailed implementation plan. Additionally, have each team submit a deliverable that explains how well they implemented their collaboration process. They should explain how the process allowed them to produce several creative team building ideas, how many ideas they generated, and how they determined which ideas were best (e.g., built on existing ideas, voted, etc.).

Provide students with feedback on the teams’ deliverables before they execute their virtual team building activity.

*Step 6. Build & Bond: Execute the Virtual Team Building Activity* *(60 minutes)*

Student teams execute their newly developed virtual team building activity.

*Step 7. Build & Bond: Reflect on the Virtual Team Building Activity* *(30-60 minutes)*

Have students submit a brief reflection on the value of the virtual team building activity to their team. Teams should indicate whether they would make changes to the activity or the process (e.g., assign distinct roles, generate more creative ideas, use different team collaboration tools, modify the virtual team building activity). Teams should also reflect on how effective they were as a team and if they bonded.

Revisit and ask students to reflect on team composition, their team’s states (e.g., cohesion, groupthink, potency, mental models, transactive memory, etc.), and whether the team experienced process loss or process gain. Have teams reflect on how the team advanced through the stages of team development and explain whether they experienced any decision-making failures (e.g., social loafing, polarization, etc.). See Appendix B for a description of the team concepts described in this step.

*Step 8. Build & Bond: Debrief* *(60 minutes)*

Ask students to share a description of their virtual team building activity with the rest of the class and how the activity added value to their team. If time allows, have students organize their thoughts and feelings within their team for a few minutes before sharing with the rest of the class. The purpose of the last portion of the debrief is to provide students with an opportunity to connect their team experience and learning to future team experiences.

**Appendix B**

# Team Concepts Contributing to the Build and Bond Experience

**Table B1: Potential Build & Bond Discussion Questions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Concepts** | **Definition** | **Discussion Questions** |
| Team Composition (Colquitt et al., 2018) | The mix of various characteristics used to describe the individuals in the team. | * Did you notice similar/differing characteristics of your team members immediately? * Did you notice similar/differing characteristics of your team members as you progressed throughout the project? |
| Member Ability (LePine et al., 1997) | The relatively stable capabilities of a team member for performing the team’s activities. | * Did you recognize that certain members of the team were more capable? Did you give them more or less work? * Did you recognize that certain members of the team were less capable? Did you give them more or less work? |
| Member Personality (Peeters et al. 2006) | The propensities and natural tendencies of a team member which explains their patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior. | * Did certain members of the team dominate the conversation? * Were others tougher to get participation from? * Did some members seem a little volatile or overly concerned about the status of the project? * Were some members of the team open to try a variety of approaches or exercises? Or, was there an effort to go with only one option? * How did these tendencies influence your team’s ability to function throughout the project? |
| Team Diversity (Williams & O’Reilly, 1998) | The degree to which team members are different from one another in terms of any attribute which is deemed appropriate. | * Was your team composed of people with similar characteristics or was there a variety of characteristics present? * Were these similar/differing characteristics easily identifiable, or did it take time to reveal them? * Did these similarities/differences create more problems or opportunities throughout the project? |
| Team Size (Stewart, 2006) | The number of team members on the team. | * How many people were on your team? * Would this project have been easier or harder with more/less people on the team? * Are you satisfied with the number of people you had on your team? |
| Team Roles (Benne & Sheats, 1948) | Pattern of behavior that a person is expected to display within the team context. | * Did certain team members make a general kind of contribution to the team? * Did the contributions help facilitate team functioning? What about task accomplishment? * Did these various forms of contributions compliment or detract from one another? How so? |
| Team Building Roles (Benne & Sheats, 1948) | Behaviors that influence the quality of the team’s social climate (e.g., encourager, harmonizer, standard setter) | * How did some of the first team interactions go? * Did anyone on the team help bring everyone together? * Did anyone on the team set a standard that everyone agreed to be held to? |
| Team Task Roles (Benne & Sheats, 1948) | Behaviors that directly facilitate or detract from the accomplishment of the team’s task (e.g., coordinator, initiator, devil’s advocate). | * Did certain people make specific contributions to the completion of the exercise? * Was anyone in the team known or expected to do certain things? |
| Team Individualistic Roles (Benne & Sheats, 1948) | Behaviors that benefit the individual more than, or at the detriment of, the team (e.g., aggressor, slacker, recognition seeker). | * Were there times where individuals on your team didn’t seem to be behaving like “team players?” * Were there times where you were ever irritated or upset with any of your team members? What did they do to make you feel this way? |
| Outcome Interdependence (Shea & Guzzo, 1987) | Degree to which team members share in the rewards that the team earns. | * Did your team discuss any peer evaluation or divvying up of points or grades? |
| Goal Interdependence (Courtright et al., 2015) | Degree to which team members have a shared vision for the team’s goal and that they align their individual goals with that shared vision. | * Did you all discuss what you were trying to accomplish? * Did everyone just want to get the exercise done, did everyone want an “A,” or were you trying to produce the best exercise possible? |
| Task Interdependence (Thompson, 1967; Van de Ven et al. 1976) | Degree to which team members interact with and rely on one another to accomplish the team’s task. | * How did you go about generating your team processes? * How did you split up the work? * How did you put together everyone’s work? |
| Pooled Interdependence (Thompson, 1967; Van de Ven et al. 1976) | Form of task interdependence where team members work independently, then add their work together to produce the team’s output. | * Did you all work individually on the project? * How much work did you do on your own relative to with your teammates? * How did you add your individual work to the project? |
| Comprehensive Interdependence (Thompson, 1967; Van de Ven et al. 1976) | Form of task interdependence where team members have a high degree of connection and coordination throughout the collaboration involved in producing the team’s output. | * Did your team complete work on the project together? * Did you have regular meetings where everyone talked through the exercise and what would be best for procedures and the exercise? |
| Sequential Interdependence (Thompson, 1967; Van de Ven et al. 1976) | Form of task interdependence where team members work in a prescribed order where members are reliant solely on the team member who precedes them in the prescribed order to produce the team’s output. | * Were there times where you felt you couldn’t do your part of the project until someone else did theirs? * Did anyone every ask you when they could expect you to have your part done? Why was that? |
| Reciprocal Interdependence (Thompson, 1967; Van de Ven et al. 1976) | Form of interdependence where team members interact with a limited subset of team members to achieve the team’s output. | * Did you split the work up in a manner where you formed “sub-teams” where each sub-team was responsible for certain parts of the project? * If you had a task similar to a teammate’s, did you communicate with that teammate to share ideas or best practices? |
| Brainstorming (method) (Osborn, 1953) | Team process used to generate creative ideas whereby team members offer as many ideas as possible about some potential issue. | * How did your team come up with possible team building exercises? * How many team building exercises did you have to choose from? * Where did all of your team building exercises come from? |
| Nominal Group Technique (method) (Delbecq & Van de Ven, 1971) | Team process used to generate creative ideas whereby team members write down their ideas and take turns sharing them with the group. | * Did everyone have a chance to suggest a possible team building exercise? * Did your team take turns sharing exercise options, as well as their potential benefits and drawbacks? |
| Groupthink (Janis, 1972) | The conformity seeking tendencies of a team which prioritize harmony, often at the cost of other team priorities. | * When a seemingly good (or even adequate) idea or suggestion was given, did everyone agree immediately? Or did someone speak up? * Were there ever times anyone didn’t agree whole-heartedly, but decided to not say anything just to avoid the discussion or potential fight? * Was anyone ever given the role of a “devil’s advocate?” |
| Social Loafing (Latané et al. 1979) | Type of motivational loss where individuals feel less accountable for the team’s outcomes relative to their independent outcomes, often resulting in the individual exerting less effort. | * Did anyone on the team seem to withdraw or not pull their weight? Why do you think that was? * Were you ever tempted to not do any part of the project (particularly the undesirable parts) because you were hoping someone else would volunteer? |
| Process Loss (Hackman, 1987) | Occurs when team outcomes are less than expected based on the capabilities of the team members. | * Were there points in the process where you think you could’ve done better if you were doing this project individually? * Knowing the people on your team, were you surprised that your final outcome wasn’t better? |
| Process Gain (Hackman, 1987) | Occurs when team outcomes are greater than expected based on the capabilities of the team members. | * Were there points in the process where you thought the project was going really well and you were producing a higher quality project than you could’ve done individually? * Knowing the people on your team, were you surprised that the final outcome was better than you originally thought possible? |
| Team States (Colquitt et al., 2018) | The shared, specific thoughts and feelings experienced by team members as a result of their experience working with one another. | * As you worked together throughout the project, did the thoughts and feelings you experienced as a team evolve over time? * Did the way you thought and felt about your team and its members change over the course of the project? How? |
| Cohesion (Festinger, 1950) | A team state that occurs when team members develop strong emotional bonds to one another and the team itself. | * Do you really like your team and its members? * Did you and your team ever get together socially or for reasons other than to work on this project? * Would you work with this team again on another project? |
| Potency (Shea & Guzzo, 1987) | A team state that occurs when team members achieve a degree of confidence that the team can be effective in various situations. | * If you were asked to work with this team on another project in this class, do you think you would be successful? * If you were asked to work together in another class, would you be able to achieve success? |
| Mental Models (Klimoski & Mohammed, 1994) | A team state that occurs when team members achieve a shared understanding of important aspects of the team and the task it is completing. | * Did your team agree on what portions of the project were particularly important? What were they? * Were there disagreements regarding which portions of the project were most important, should be completed first, etc.? |
| Transactive Memory (Wegner, 1987) | A team state that occurs when team member’s specialized knowledge is effectively integrated into a system of memory for the team. | * Were there members of the team who were particularly skilled at certain things (e.g., taking notes, putting powerpoints together, presentation skills, etc.)? If so, were you able to effectively utilize these skill sets? If not, what held you back from being able to do so? |
| Stages of Team Development (Colquitt et al., 2018) | The process through which teams progress from newly developed to well-established. | * How has your team progressed from a group of individuals to an interdependent team? |
| Forming (Tuckman, 1965) | The first stage of team development, typically characterized by team members orienting themselves and attempting to discover boundaries, expectations, etc. | * How were you originally put into teams? * Did you know your team members before? If not, how did you get to know one another? * What were some of the early discussions like? Did you establish any expectations? If so, what were they? |
| Storming (Tuckman, 1965) | The second stage of team development, typically characterized by idea exchange and potential conflict. | * When you moved beyond formations and introductions, did you start talking about the project immediately? * Did anyone dominate the conversation or take charge? * Were there differing ideas about how the team should conduct itself or what the exercise should be? * If there was any conflict, how was it handled/resolved? |
| Norming (Tuckman, 1965) | The third stage of team development, typically characterized by acknowledgement of needing to work together, cooperation, and feelings of solidarity. | * Was there a point where the team agreed on what needed to be done to complete the project? What did that look like? * Was there a moment where you felt a sense of pride in the team and how you’d get through the project together? |
| Performing (Tuckman, 1965) | The fourth stage of team development, typically characterized by team members’ comfort with one another and progress towards the team’s goals. | * At what point did your team move from acquaintances to a unified team? * When did your team start to make substantial progress towards accomplishing the task and any team goals you may have set? |
| Adjourning (Tuckman, 1965) | The fifth stage of team development, typically characterized by team members’ anxiety as they debrief, disengage, and separate from the team. | * Was there ever concern over whether you completed all of the final team tasks? * Did the team ever congratulate one another or express gratitude for the chance to work with one another? * Did your team ever celebrate the completion of the project? |
| Punctuated Equilibrium (Gersick, 1988) | A model of team development characterized by initial behavioral pattern establishment that lasts for approximately the first half of its life, followed by a realization that a chance rapid change to their pattern is required to complete the team’s task. | * From the beginning of the project, did your team development and progression advance in a somewhat less linear/inconsistent manner? * Did your team do basic introductions, then not really work on the project right away? * Did your team have an “uh-oh” moment approximately halfway through the project where you realized you were behind and needed to start working immediately? |

# Developing Creative Mindsets

There are several published exercises and games that can help students think creatively before beginning the Build and Bond Exercise. A few examples are listed in the chart below.

**Table B2: Creativity Exercises**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Description of Exercise** |
| Armstrong (1999) | Student teams generate a list of possible products or services by utilizing a specific raw material. Next, the team selects one idea, names the product (or service), develops a slogan, and performs a video advertisement. |
| Crowne (2019) | Student teams complete a jigsaw puzzle. The team member that constructs the puzzle is blindfolded. This exercise requires significant communication and creativity from remaining team members. |
| Keiser (2020) | Student teams participate in a cartoon caption contest |

If time is limited, an instructor may wish to play a simple and quick warm-up game to help students think creatively. One game that takes approximately 5-10 minutes is to have students take turns using each letter of the alphabet in order to name a specific category of items. For example, students could generate a list of nouns found in a backyard (e.g., **A**pple tree, **B**asketball hoop, **C**hicken Coop, **D**eck, etc.).

**Appendix C**

**Build and Bond - Student Group Recording Document**

Please use this document to note the progress your team is making. The names of your team members are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Step 1: Develop the team collaboration process**

Use the following prompts to Identify the team process used in Build and Bond and help you through the development stage.

1. Team collaboration tools you plan to use. (Microsoft Teams, CMS discussion forums, Zoom ect.)
2. Your team goal interdependence is described as:
3. Your team outcome interdependence is described as:
4. Task interdependence you plan to use.

❒ pooled ❒ sequential ❒ comprehensive ❒ reciprocal

Why will you use this technique? (Use research to support your answer)

1. Processes used for idea generation while minimizing group think.

❒ group ❒ nominal technique ❒ brainwriting ❒ structured brainstorming  
❒ Others:

1. What responsibilities do all team members share?
2. What do you expect your team norms and behavioral expectations within the team will be?
3. What team building and team task roles will each team member assume?

**Instructor feedback:**

**Step 2: Idea generation and selection of activity**

During this step, you will use the process developed during Step 1, develop a list of several positive virtual team building activities, select and develop one idea, and create the virtual team building implementation plan.

1. How many team building ideas did your team generate in #1? (As prompted in 1?)
2. How did you determine which ideas would work best?

**Instructor feedback:**

**Step 3: Conduct the virtual team building activity.**

During this step, your team will conduct the virtual team building activity you developed during Step 2.

**Step 4: Reflection on the activity**

What has your team identified as the value of the activity to your team? Do you believe the virtual team building activity you developed was effective? Why or why not?

Reflecting on the activity conducted in step 3, what changes to the activity or process would you suggest?

Describe your team in terms of effectiveness and if you believe members bonded or developed interpersonal relationships.

**Step 5: Debrief**

1. Individual members will verbally share a description of the activity and the activity’s value to the team.
2. Individuals may verbally share why previous team experiences were of less value.