

УДК 331.103:159.37

Victoria Shapolova

PhD in Pedagogy, senior teacher, Pedagogy and Psychology of Social Systems
Management Department of the academician I. Zyazyun, National Technical
University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute", Ukraine
E-mail: viktoriya-shapolova@mail.ru

Olga Kvasnyk

PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor, Pedagogy and Psychology of Social Systems
Management Department of the academician I. Zyazyun, National Technical
University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute", Ukraine
E-mail: kvasnykov@ukr.net

**DEVELOPMENT OF TEAMBUILDING SCIENCE IN HISTORICAL
RETROSPECTIVES**

Abstract: *The work is dedicated to the research in history and development of teambuilding science since the moment of appearance of the group work phenomenon up to system projects on team creation and functioning. The authors analyze the trends in scientific thought on the issues of phased changes of the substance, structure, and methodological basis for teambuilding formation. There is also given the modern notion of the elements of the researched branch, and the notion of the definition itself is given.*

Keywords: *teambuilding, team, teamwork, group dynamics, teamwork skills, team spirit, leadership, rope courses, outdoor education.*

Вікторія Шаполова

кандидат педагогічних наук, старший викладач, кафедра педагогіки і психології
управління соціальними системами ім. академіка І.А. Зязюна, Національний
технічний університет "Харківський політехнічний інститут"
E-mail: viktoriasapolova@gmail.com

Ольга Квасник

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, кафедра педагогіки і психології управління
соціальними системами ім. академіка І.А. Зязюна, Національний технічний
університет "Харківський політехнічний інститут"
E-mail: kvasnykov@ukr.net

СТАНОВЛЕННЯ НАУКИ ТИМБІЛДІНГУ В ІСТОРИЧНІЙ РЕТРОСПЕКТИВІ

Анотація: *У роботі досліджено історію розвитку та становлення науки командування з моменту виникнення явища групової роботи і до моменту системних розробок зі створення та функціонування команд. Авторами проведено аналіз наукової*

©Victoria Shapolova, Olga Kvasnyk, 2017

думки з питань поетапної зміни змісту, структури та методологічної бази формування тимбілдингу. Наведено сучасне уявлення про складові досліджуваної наукової галузі, а також дане визначення самій дефініції.

Ключові слова: тимбілдинг, команда, командна робота, групова динаміка, навички командної роботи, командний дух, лідерство, мотузкові курси, «OutdoorEducation»

Викторія Шаполова, Ольга Квасник

СТАНОВЛЕНИЕ НАУКИ ТИМБИЛДИНГА В ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЙ РЕТРОСПЕКТИВЕ

Аннотация: В работе исследована история развития и становления науки командообразования с момента возникновения явления групповой работы и до момента системных разработок по созданию и функционированию команд. Авторами проведен анализ научной мысли по вопросам поэтапного изменения содержания, структуры и методологической базы формирования тимбилдинга. Приведены современное представление о составляющих исследуемой научной отрасли, а также дано определение самой дефиниции.

Ключевые слова: тимбилдинг, команда, командная работа, групповая динамика, навыки командной работы, командный дух, лидерство, веревочные курсы, «OutdoorEducation»

Problem statement in general and its connection with urgent scientific or practical tasks. Modern researchers have often accentuated the need for our state's social and economic area in effective work of its components which depends on results of their flexible modernizing, adaptability to functioning conditions. In any case, systemacy and processes dynamics need coordination and exactness, distribution of roles and functions, foreseeing results and responsibility for their efficiency. These are the very characteristics innate to any good performance activity which is assured by personalities who possess certain directedness and are aimed at the utmost result. At present there exists the tendency to joining efforts of such activity subject and forming by them a single organism capable of meeting the strictest demands of the present. Scientists have proved the fact that the mentioned unique phenomenon is named a team. Consequently, there arises the need in research, analysis, and selection of methods that ensure an opportunity of creating or will help increase its functioning level.

The latest sources and publications analysis wherein solving this problem has been started and whereupon the author relies. As a result of observations and conducted research it was proved that in the process of society's historic development many scientists devoted their time to the study of the problem of team creating, functioning and development that later on went into the foundations of teambuilding. In their works U. Schutz, K. Levin, B. Tuckman, A. Maslow, M. Belbin, E. Mayo view some elements of scientific and practical developments that later formed the basis of teambuilding.

Theoretical issues of teams forming and evolvment were developed in the concepts by J. Adair, M. Belbin, R. Kohn, R. Likert, Ch. Margerison and D. McKen, E. Porter, B. Tuckman et al. Among the modern directions is team projects management analysis (T. DeMarco, G. Kertzner, D. Cleland); also, scientific surveys in team interdisciplinary science are undertaken (B. Jones, S. Kissler, D. Stockolls, B. Uzzi, S. Watchey, W. Hugstrom, K. Hall). The native researchers in their works tend to study the management of processes of interpersonal interaction within a team (N. Kolominsky, G. Lozhkin, S. Maksymenko), conduct analysis of organizational culture's value essence, leaders' role in its evolvment (L. Karamushka, O.

Bodnarchuk, O. Romanovsky). Besides, scientific researches of the problems of team development have been undertaken on the basis of managerial and linear teams analysis in various spheres, particularly in business (T. Bazarov, Yu. Zhukov, T. Zinkevich-Yevstigneyeva, V. Kazmiren), education (O. Bondarchuk, N. Gavrysh, N. Kolominsky, R. Kon), state service (Ya. Atanasov, V. Barko, V. Bebyk, A. Derkach, V. Miliayeva). A separate place is given to the problems of team activities in sport (Yu. Kolomeitsev, G. Lozhkin, V. Rumyantseva, V. Sopov, Yu. Khanin, et al.).

Highlighting of previously unresolved parts of the general problem this article deals with. Interest in teambuilding grows day to day. Researchers study both the character of interaction among team-members and the traits inherent in them, and the spheres where teambuilding can be applied (apart from recreation), and the means and methods of its functioning, etc. Among a great number of researches dedicated to the problems of detection of substance characteristics and the structure of the notions of “team”, “teambuilding” and others, there are separate attempts to clarify the historic aspect of their formation and development. Nevertheless, the authors have discovered very few substantial researches aimed at detailed study of historic aspects of teambuilding’s development, particularly in the sphere of scientific knowledge. They are separate and do not cover all the historic facts in full extent.

The aims of the article (goal-setting). Within the context of the researched problem, the aim of this work is to make a mass-scaled systematic analysis concerning key moments of historic development of teambuilding as a science which presumed detection of key theoretical and practical principles that would enhance creating of a fundamental scientific and practical basis of this sphere, as well as clarifying distinct borders of the notion and content of the definition.

Statement of the main material with complete substantiation of obtained scientific results. Science literature analysis on psychology, management, philosophy, sociology, and other sources revealed the absence of a certain date of the first use of the term of “teambuilding”. Some authors think that the founder of teambuilding was the author of Hottorn experiment (1927 – 1932) a well-known American professor, psychologist and sociologist Elgin Mayo, others mention an American researcher and practitioner in organization development William Dyer who published the first book on teambuilding in 1977.

Analysis of historic sources proves that the first initiators of measures aimed at teambuilding, team spirit support, were Roman generals of antiquity time (about 200 years BC). In ancient Rome in order to sustain combat zeal and solidarity in soldiers-legionaries there were conducted various physical exercises, competitions in cleverness, strength, and endurance. Roman generals tried to form an atmosphere of solidarity among their subordinates and came to the conclusion that there was nothing better than gaming.

A more scientific approach to solving this issue was undertaken by such historic figures as Guy Julius Caesar (100 – 44 BC), his descendant Octavian Augustus (63 – 14 BC), Spartacus (111 – 71 BC), et al. They became the founders of the system of means improving Roman soldiers’ morale on the basis of sports competitions and sport games. The utmost popularity was won by the Olympic Games which remain topical nowadays and even gained in scale and popularity. The same means that were to enrich and consolidate team-and-military spirit and thus were aimed at destroying enemy’s unity guided well-known Russian, American, and European leaders like William the Conqueror (1027/1028 – 1087), Richard Coeur d’ Lion (1157 – 1199), Alexander Nevsky (1221 – 1263), Napoleon Bonaparte (1769 – 1821), Mikhail Kutuzov (1745 – 1813), et al. [1].

Analysis of key experiments and theories enhancing development of the teambuilding concept enabled to determine the following scientific achievements. In 1897 there was set the cyclists experiment by N. Triplet wherein the researcher compared efficiency of an individual action performed alone and within a group. Thus appear for the first time the notions of “co-acting

groups”, “social facilitation effect”, and “social inhibition effect”. At the end of the XIX – beginning of the XX centuries there appeared works by L. Gumplovich, E. Durkheim, G. Zimmel, Ch. Coolie, G. Tard, F. Tennisou and other scientists who researched small groups.

At the beginning of the XX century F. Alport Ch. Barnard, T. Newcome, M. Sheriff, W. White and other scientists in their works viewed social processes and tried to explain specifics of human existence. These scientific works created the foundation for theoretical-and-practical direction in clarifying specifics of small groups.

The beginning of 1900s. The French army officer George Herbert Mid created his own method of personality harmonious development which was built mainly on combining physical culture lessons and exercises directed at improvement of fortitude in future soldiers and sailors, forming courage that were taken in the open grounds. This method got named “the Natural Method”. In France it is also called “Hebertism” which was actively developed during WWII and later became physical education standard in the French Army [1].

In 1920s F. Alport formulated his understanding of a group as a totality of ideals, concepts, and habits sounding in each of the individual consciousnesses and exist only within these consciousnesses. His refusal to consider a group as a certain reality was explained by the researcher by the absence of adequate research methods which correlated with his positivist positions.

In 1924 – 1936 American sociologist and psychologist E. Mayo conducted the Hottorn experiment. He studied the influence of various factors (work and labor organization conditions, wages, interpersonal relations, managing style, etc.) on labor efficiency increase and proved special role of the human and the group factors [4].

G. Highman introduced in the 1930ies the term of “reference groups”. The author explained this notion as a real or imaginative social entity which poses for an individual as a standard, an example to be followed. The period of the 30ies through the beginning of 40ies introduced to psychology, sociology, pedagogy, management and other sciences the laboratory experiment by Muzarfer Sharif on studying group norms. The author distinguishes two types of groups: the actual membership group and the reference group [11].

B. White when applying the inclusive observation method realized the “live” groups program in a big city. On the basis of research of managerial activity at an industrial organization, Ch. Bernard puts forward the idea of two-dimensional viewing of a group process (from the position of group tasks solving, and from the position of maintaining inner balance and unity).

In the 1940s Curt Levin created the concept of the group dynamics. He also expressed the idea of conducting group trainings to change some or other peculiarities of behavior in a group [7].

In the 50s – through 60s Douglas McGregor created a universally known Theory X and Theory Y which he tried to comply with the motivation factors on a rational and acceptable basis. He viewed a personality and its attitude to labor in two opposite dimensions: in its natural need in activity and reliance on self-discipline, self-consciousness, management’s trust to workers, as well as from the point of value-oriented attitude of an individual to labor and total control on the part of controlling bodies. Later he worked on Z Theory in which he tried to join the needs and desires of a corporation with those of a separate individual [6].

William Schutz in 1958 offered his theory of interpersonal relation and psychological compatibility which he titled “Fundamental Orientation of Interpersonal Relations”) according to which the three most important factors of interpersonal relations – inclusion, control, influence – determine most of the situations in human interaction.

In the beginning of 1960s there was mentioned for the first time in the USA the practical use of the teambuilding, namely “Rope Courses” which appeared as a program of psychological and physical rehabilitation for the US soldiers after the war in Viet Nam [5]. At present in Eu-

rope rope parks are often used for common recreation of company employees or teambuilding. The first rope parks were created in woods – trees enable to attach various constructions. Rope parks are often combined with different kinds of activities. They may consist of various “paths” among the trees, appliances for climbing, pulley descending, etc. They have different names: rope parks, cable parks, tie-parks, sky-parks, extreme-parks and so on.

In 1965 Bruce Tuckman created the FSNP concept describing the stages in a team life – Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing. In 1967 Meredith Belbin studied maximization of teams’ performing and their dynamics. He accentuated on the biggest share of role distribution in a team’s efficiency increase and introduced the nine roles theory [7].

In the 1970s Abraham Maslow initiated the human needs hierarchy pyramid which is profoundly used in teambuilding to study teams’ motivation and determining the degree of development of a team and its needs. In 1977 William Dyer published the first book dedicated to teambuilding in which the boundaries of this phenomenon were outlined [2].

In 1979 – 1983 John Adair was engaged in researches of theory and practices of leadership concept wherein he accentuated the possibilities of upbringing and passing leadership skills, and also touched indirectly the issue of teambuilding. American business trainers in the 1980s turned the programs of psychological and physical rehabilitation with elements of team spirit and solidarity into a new business service on the corporate market. There was initiation of a separate business branch – teambuilding – which spread among the Western business world. In the USA teambuilding has adopted quite a standard form of a regulated rope course which was conducted simultaneously in every of the 50 states [3].

In the 1980s there was an intensive forming and application of the “Outdoor Education”. In the 1990s in the USA and Great Britain there started to form a separate branch in management named Outdoor Development Management, a branch of business training and development using the natural environment conditions.

Analysis of the experience of practical application of work-teams by IBM, Texas Instruments, Hewlett Packard and the research results conducted by the Center of Team Study at North-Texas University and Zenger Miller research center enable to distinguish five stages of team evolvement: the start, indetermination, leader-orientation, clearly structured teams, self-guiding teams.

The period of 1990s saw the use of related terms which became topical and reached their popularity peak in the West: Corporal Adventure Training (CAT), as well as Experience Based Training and Development (EBTD). In 1993 there appeared the first official organization in the USA which coordinates and controls companies dealing in rope courses – Association in Challenge Course Technologies. In 1998 there appears the first official European organization coordinating and controlling companies dealing in rope courses – European Rope Course Association [1].

In Ukraine teambuilding as a branch, having adopted key findings of scientists mentioned above, began to develop intensively at the beginning of the 1990s in the form of common recreation of employees of various companies, organizations, factories, departments, institutes, etc. Later on to the feast were added game competitions which still later grew into business trainings where specialists in personnel business actively realized adopted from the western partners measures to create positive attitude, active recreation, teams’ consolidation, working on skills to solve various collective tasks and decision-making in stressful conditions. In the XXI century the number of organizations dealing in teambuilding keeps on growing all over the world, Ukraine included.

At present stage of the world’s development, considering scientific and practical potential of both past and present scientific research, Teambuilding means specially developed means directed at solidarization of a united, strong, and efficient team whose members are aimed at achiev-

ing a common goal, interaction, mutual supplementation, support, mutual respect, and harmonious interaction.

Nowadays most of the scientists distinguish the three components of the structure of the notion of teambuilding [1,10]:

1. Forming and development of teamskills which are the basis of the system of team management introduction, namely:

- harmonization of the common goal with individual goals;
- taking responsibility for the team result;
- situational leadership (leadership for a task) and flexible change of style according to the peculiarities of the task;
- constructive interaction and self-governing;
- adoption of the single team decision and discussing it with all team-members.

2. Forming of team-spirit, i.e. a scope of psychological phenomena characterizing employees' informal attitude towards colleagues and the organization. Forming of team-spirit is a complex of measures directed at:

- enhancing the feeling of consolidation, forming a stable feeling of "us";
- development of mutual trust, understanding, and accepting of every employee's individual traits;
- creating motivation for mutual activity;
- gaining experience in highly efficient common actions;
- increase in management's informal authority;
- development of loyalty in program participants to their attitude towards the organization.

3. Team forming – mechanical actions on selecting, optimizing team structure and function- and role-distribution:

- efficient use of the team-members' strong points;
- distribution of roles in the team for gaining optimal results;
- forming a new structure as a result of merging, takeover, or restructuring of an enterprise;
- creating working atmosphere in the course of team formation;
- adjustment of horizontal ties within a collective, regional structures.

Such tri-component essence of the content enables to uncover in detail the multifacetedness of the phenomenon of forming, development, and functioning of a team, its evolvement, improvement and meeting the demands of time. Teambuilding as a science has proved its efficiency and importance in many spheres of human activity, including management.

The results of the research and perspectives of further studies in this field. As a result of systemizing information from various sources we can state that the science of teambuilding has an interesting history of its coming into being, the sources of which we consider the Roman Empire where generals tried to form an atmosphere of unity among their subordinates. From sustaining combat spirit in soldiers to the study of efficiency of an individual's actions, from researches in group interaction to efficiency in organizations' activity – this is the road of ascertainment the significance of teambuilding. The beginning of this science forming we consider the period of 1890s – 1920s. The modern interpretation of the notion, in our opinion, has not yet gained uniformity among scientists. In our opinion, teambuilding is specially developed means directed at consolidation of a united, strong, and efficient team whose members are aimed at achieving the common goal, interaction, mutual supplementation, support, mutual respect, and harmonious interaction. The most theoretically substantiated is its tri-component content, namely knowledge, abilities, skills in teamwork, team spirit, mechanical actions on selection, optimizing the structure of the team and function- and role-distribution. We consider the prospective of further research being the defining criteria of team-selection,

efficient methods of team formation, the study of principles of team-spirit promotion, determining the structure of skills needed for team-members, etc.

Список літератури:

1. Исхакова М. Г. Тимбилдинг: раскрытие ресурсов организации и личности / М.Г. Исхакова — СПб.: Речь, 2010. — С. 8-18.
2. Maslow A. H. A Theory of Human Motivation // Psychological Review/ A. H Maslow. - 1943, Vol. 50 № 4, pp. 370-396.
3. Brower, M.J. 1995, 'Empowering Teams: What, Why and How', Empowerment in Organizations, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 13-25.
4. Bradley, J. H., & Frederic, J. H. (1997). The effect of personality type on team performance. Journal of Management Development, 16(5), p. 337-353.
5. European Rope Course Association [Електроннийресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.erca.cc>
6. Sundstrom, E. Work Teams: Applications and Effectiveness / Sundstrom, E., De Meuse, K.P. Futrell, D.//American Psychologist, - 1990, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 120-133.
7. O'Reilly, Organisational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification and Internalization on Prosocial Behaviour. / O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. // Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, - 1986, 492-499.
8. Robbins, S.P. Organisational behavior (5th Ed) NSW: Pearson Education. / Robbins, S.P., Judge, T. A., Millett, B., Waters-Marsh, T - 2008 160
9. Tansky, J. The Relationship Between Organisational Support, Employee Development and Organisational Commitment: An Empirical Study. / Tansky, J. Cohen, D. // Human resource Development Quarterly, 1(3), - 2001. 285-300.
10. Tannenbaum, S. I. Teambuilding an dits influence on team effectiveness: An examination of conceptual and empirical developments./ Tannenbaum, S. I., Beard, R. L., & Salas, E // In Kelley, K. (Ed.), Issues, theory, and research in industrial/organisational psychology. Amsterdam: Elsevier. - 1992
11. Tansky, J. The Relationship between Organizational Support, Employee Development and Organizational Commitment: An Empirical Study. / Tansky, J. & Cohen, D. // Human resource Development Quarterly, 1(3),- 2001, 285-300.
12. Wheelan, S. A. Creating effective teams: A guide for members and leaders / Wheelan, S. A / (2nd Ed).USA: Sage Publications, Inc. 2005

References:

1. Ishakova M. G. (2010) *Timbuilding: raskryitie resursov organizatsii i lichnosti* [Teambuilding: disclosure of the resources of the organization and personality] — SPb.: Rech., — S. 8-18.
2. Maslow A. H. (1943) A Theory of Human Motivation // Psychological Review/ A. H Maslow. Vol. 50 № 4, pp. 370-396.
3. Brower, M.J. (1995) 'Empowering Teams: What, Why and How', Empowerment in Organizations, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 13-25.
4. Bradley, J. H., & Frederic, J. H. (1997). The effect of personality type on team performance. Journal of Management Development, 16(5), p. 337-353.
5. European Rope Course Association [Електроннийресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.erca.cc>
6. Sundstrom, E. (1990) Work Teams: Applications and Effectiveness / Sundstrom, E., De Meuse, K.P. Futrell, D.//American Psychologist, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 120-133.

7. O'Reilly, (1986) Organisational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effectsof Compliance, Identification and Internalization on Prosocial Behaviour. / O'Reilly, C. A., &Chatman, J. // Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 492-499.
8. Robbins, S.P. (2008) Organisational behavior (5th Ed) NSW: Pearson Education. / Robbins, S.P., Judge, T. A., Millett, B., Waters-Marsh, T , 160
9. Tansky, J. (2001) The Relationship Between Organisational Support, Employee Development and Organisational Commitment: An Empirical Study. / Tansky, J. Cohen, D.// Human resource Development Quarterly, 1(3), 285-300.
10. Tannenbaum, S. I. (1992) Teambuilding an ditsinfluenceon team effectiveness: An examination of conceptual and empirical developments./ Tannenbaum, S. I., Beard, R. L., &Salas, E // In Kelley, K. (Ed.), Issues, theory, and researchin industrial/organisational psychology. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
11. Tansky, J. (2001) The Relationship between Organizational Support, Employee Development and Organizational Commitment: An Empirical Study. / Tansky, J. &Cohen, D. // Human resource Development Quarterly, 1(3), 285-300.
12. Wheelan, S. A. (2005) Creating effective teams: A guide for members and leaders / Wheelan, S. A / (2nd Ed).USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії: 28.08.2017