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**Organizational Behavior: A Study on Managers, Employees, and Teams**

**Summary:-**

Many organizational behavior researchers believe that organizations are systems. The two basic types of organization systems are closed and open. Many contemporary organizations are open systems that interact with their environment. A closed system does not depend on its environment and can function without the consumption of external resources. An open system must interact with the environment to survive by consuming and exporting resources to the environment. In an open and closed organization system, the people are the human resources of the organization who have specific skills, the purpose of the organization is the mission, vision, and goal for existing, the plan of the organization is the strategy, competitive advantages, and objectives of the organization, and the prioritiesof the organization are what drive the organization to thrive or excel, which in most cases is revenue. Schwartz, Jones, & McCarty (2010) explain, “No matter how much value we produce today—whether it’s measured in dollars or sales or goods or widgets—it’s never enough.

Simply defined, a team is composed of two or more individuals who possess any number of common goals. Exhibiting skill and workflow interdependencies, members combine their differing roles in the completion of a given task. It must be noted, however, that a salient component to team structure is a platform for social interaction, which continues to become more virtual. For the purposes of this article the author’s will offer a more thorough treatment of teams. Research focusing on teams began more than fifty years ago in the area of social psychology. The more recent shift in the organization of work, however, also brought about a shift to the study of teams as an organizational construct (Moreland, Hogg, & Hains, 1994). A modern work system that is dynamic and complex creates commensurate demands on teams to coordinate and combine skill sets and resources to resolve tasks efficiently and effectively (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006). From an organizational perspec- tive, a work system composed of teams creates a pool of collective knowledge, skills, and resources that People Plan Priorities Purpose 90 Journal of Management Policy and Practice vol. 12(1) 2011 support members in resolving a task. Therefore, team task becomes the focal point around which work structure and team coordination are determined.

A total of 100 managers working for the same organization located in the San Francisco, Bay Area filled out a short survey relating to teams. Also, a total of 200 employees working for the same organization filled out a survey relating to teams. This strategy allows for a more comprehensive study that illuminates the perspectives of both managers and employees. As a part of the survey, each part- icipant also answered questions relating to demographic. Table 1 (Managers) and Table 2 (Employees) represent the demographic nature of the population.

This research showed that female managers valued communication with their teams more than their male counterparts. Organizations that value communication, accountability, and transparency are the ones that are more successful during times of organizational change. If female managers understand the importance of communication better than their male counterparts as this study has demonstrated, then organizations should feel comfortable hiring and promoting females to management positions. Kaifi and Noori (2010) explain, “Although, both men and women can increase their emotional intelligence levels, this study has shown that women have higher levels of emotional intelligence which may make them the better manager of the 21st century” (p. 19). Many believe that women have innate leadership skills that can make them more approachable, understanding, and effective. For example, some believe that women are more organized, empathetic, creative, and accountable. As a result of having innate leadership skills, females understand the importance of connecting when communicating. Maxwell (2010) explains, “Connecting is the ability to identify with people and relate to them in a way that increases your influence on them” (p. 3). There are also different levels of connecting to others depending on different factors (e.g., formal vs. informal settings). Maxwell (2010) clearly defines what it means to connect with others at each of the three levels. When connecting one on one, it is important to “Talk more about the other person and less about yourself” (p. 20). When connecting in a group, “Look for ways to compliment people in the group for their ideas and actions (2010, p. 21). Finally, when connecting with an audience, “let your listeners know that you are excited to be with them” (Maxwell, 2010, p. 21). Each level of connecting requires different levels of energy. Maxwell states, “Connecting always requires energy. The larger the group, the more energy that’s required to connect” (2010, p. 93).

The study findings also confirmed the hypothesis that female employees will contribute to team outcomes more than male employees. The authors of this study define team outcomes as an assessment comprised of two measures: team performance and team effectiveness. Adopting the definitions offered by Forrester and Tashchian (2006), the authors describe team performance as an efficiency competency that refers to the amount of work the team delivers and its adherence to temporal goals. Effectiveness, on the other hand, describes the quality of output produced by the team and whether the team has met its goals and objectives. Women may contribute more to team task completion than men because they have the advantage of being better communicators. Communication skills are imperative for success in today’s business world where task completion is achieved in organizational systems of multiple interdependent horizontal and vertical levels. As Colquitt, Lepine, and Wesson (2011) explain, “Much of today’s work is accomplished interdependently and involves communication among members, and therefore, the effectiveness of communication plays an important role in determining whether there is process gain or process loss” (p. 422). Furthermore, communication may benefit female employees by allowing them to better share ideas with members, make recommendations, and seek assistance when encountering an issue they cannot personally resolve.

**CONCLUSION:-**

Theoretically, it is important to understand how and why teamwork affects people’s success in the workplace. Practically, it is important for managers to know whether teamwork affects performance because it proxies cohesiveness and synergy. The study presented in this article clearly suggests that teamwork affects people’s careers and workplace interactions and therefore is worthy of continued scholarly investigation.
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**It’s time to sober up: The direct costs, side effects and long-term consequences of creativity and innovation**

**Summary:-**

 In this paper, it has been suggested that creativity and innovation are the beginning and ending points of an innovation process in organizations – a process that unfolds in a series of steps (see Fig. 1). The process starts with creativity, defined as the generation of an idea that is novel and useful (Amabile, 1996; Mumford & Gustafson, 1988). A creative idea can be produced in a focal organization or borrowed from the outside (Zhou & Shalley, 2011). If relevant organizational decision makers find the creative idea appealing, they will support the development of this creative idea into a full-fledged invention or prototype (Mueller, Melwani, Loewenstein, & Deal, 2018). The last step of the innovation process requires commercializing an invention into an innovation that necessarily involves the successful implementation of a prototype into production and bringing it to market (Edwards & Gordon, 1984). In other words, the transition from a creative idea to invention involves idea implementation, and the transition from invention to innovation involves invention implementation. Though these transitions are distinct, they are often treated as interchangeable (Garud et al., 2013).

In this paper the coverage of the literatures on creativity and innovation is wide-ranging. In the chapter that follows, we review many different literatures, spanning multiple levels of analysis and crossing several related fields. The processes leading from a creative idea to an invention and finally to innovation are complex and diverse in their mechanisms and consequences. Yet, there are a few general parallels in effects of creativity and innovation on organizations. Both creativity and innovation may bring not only benefits, but also significant costs to companies and their employees Although the variety of these possible consequences is large, they can be analytically grouped into three major themes: (1) inherent costs of action, (2) side effects, and (3) long-term consequences. We use these common themes to organize our review and analysis of creativity and innovation as independent variables. We cover both positive and negative consequences of creativity and innovation for organizations, with a main emphasis on the negative effects that have been largely ignored. Table 1 provides a road map for our review and analysis.

**EVALUATING THE CONSEQUENCES OF CREATIVITY**

Creativity is a crucial driving force behind most, if not all, new endeavors. In fields as disparate as art, science, and technology, creative ingenuity is a highly desirable skill (Alperson, 2003; Kern, 2010; Simonton, 2004). Any occupation that demands the generation of new ideas, new technology, or creative content actively seeks to attract individuals with creative talent (Florida, 2014). Nevertheless, many disparate streams of research converge on the possibility of negative consequences related to creativity at work.

**Inherent costs of creativity**

In this section, we review the inherent costs involved in being creative. Creative ideas, employees and leaders are likely to encounter immediate resistance. We focus on four key sources of resistance: (a) explicit resistance to creative ideas, (b) implicit resistance to creative ideas, (c) resistance from creative employees, and (d) resistance to creative leadership. Countering these oppositional forces in the pursuit of creativity is likely to generate significant direct costs.

The desire for creative employees has even traveled to the upper echelons of many firms. According to a recent survey of 1500 chief executives, conducted by IBM’s Institute for Business Value, CEOs identify “creativity,” the ability to generate novel and useful solutions, as the most important leadership competency for the successful organization of the future (Kern, 2010). Creativity helps leaders move organizations in profitable new directions, a view supported by management research showing that leaders with creative ability are more effective at promoting positive change and inspiring their followers than leaders who lack creative ability (House & Howell, 1992; Mumford & Connelly, 1991; Mumford, Marks, Connelly, Zaccaro, & Reiter-Palmon, 2000; Shin & Zhou, 2003; Shin & Zhou, 2007; Sternberg, 2007; Tierney, Farmer, & Graen, 1999; Yukl, 1989). Despite the desire for and benefit of creative employees and particularly leaders, growing evidence suggests that creative people can generate impressions that are not entirely positive. In other words, people form impressions and make judgments about others based on the kinds of ideas they express. One might assume that pitching a creative idea would generate favorable impressions, given how desirable creative ideas allegedly are. Yet, individuals who pitch creative ideas are viewed as quirky, unpredictable and unconventional (Elsbach & Kramer, 2003). In some industries such as product design, film, marketing and venture capital funding, these are favorable impressions (Elsbach & Kramer, 2003). Generally though, they are not. Consequently, creative people can be filtered out on the way to the top. For example, one study showed that employees who pitch a creative idea may be viewed as having less leadership potential than employees who share an idea that is purely practical (Mueller, Goncalo, & Kamdar, 2011). This happens because prototypes of “creative people” and “effective leaders” may sometimes clash in the minds of evaluators. The most prototypical kind of leader is expected to organize and coordinate groups to diminish uncertainty and promote order by emphasizing shared goals (Phillips & Lord, 1981). The prototypical leader is also expected to conform to group norms and goals in order to symbolically support the group identity (van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer, & Hogg, 2004) and to promote collective action (Lord, Foti, & de Vader, 1984). Individuals who behave in ways that convey these characteristics to others are readily categorized as fitting the leadership prototype.

In the last section, we noted the direct costs of creative action. Because of a deeply rooted, though rarely acknowledged bias against creativity, openly expressing a creative idea can have immediate, negative consequences. In this section, we turn to the potential indirect side-effects of actively engaging in the creative process. Obviously, undertaking the effort to develop creative ideas will increase the odds of yielding creative outcomes, but here we think more broadly about the other unintended consequences that might arise as a by-product of being creative. In particular, we look at the following types of positive and negative side effects: (a) creative disinhibition; (b) stereotype reduction, (c) social connection, and (d) creative inflation.

**Conclusion**

In this paper, we demonstrated why, when evaluating benefits of either creativity or innovation, it is important to look not just at their total benefits, but at net benefits after taking into consideration all possible costs. It is eminently practical to fully consider all of the potential costs that might be incurred before deciding to pursue creativity and innovation in organizations. A more complete understanding of the costs involved might allow organizations to anticipate and diffuse the inevitable byproducts of creativity at work and the implementation of innovation. We see many opportunities for advancing theory in management and related disciplines based on the idea of creativity and innovation being important and useful independent variables. Indeed, our review has barely scratched the surface of the many new questions that remain to be asked along the lines that we have outlined here. Thus, we propose the alternative conceptualization of creativity and innovation as independent variables as a new area of inquiry that holds considerable promise.
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