Towards the understanding of nature of groups and teams

Groups and teams are made up of individuals who have a common goal. In most cases, individuals from groups, which later become a team. According to psychoanalytical object-relations theory (Sher, 2004), individuals, groups, and teams are not independent entities but rather are constructs that bond organizational expectations to human feelings and beliefs. Groups and teams rely on a matrix style of management (Gilley & Kerno Jr., 2010), are influenced by the existing organizational authority, and participants show commitment because of the expectations demanded by their organizations. The distinction between groups and teams is that while groups demand a lot of control, planning, and direction in its leadership, are guided by a series of well-established goals and objectives, reward members depending on performance (Seat & Sundstrom, 2004), and used when executing specific functional tasks in an organization, teams demand collaborative relationships among members, are guided by a mission in fulfilling their mandate (Offermann, 2006), and can exist in or outside an organization. Therefore, teams are groups with a higher purpose in achieving goals because of creativity, mutual sharing of benefits, attributes, small member size mostly between 5-12 people, and a shared purpose.   A group or team is always formed in handling different problems in an organization. Therefore, the management must be keen when determining which one to use for effective task execution and complimentary results. It is best to use groups in instances where tasks are easy, especially when results are expected within a specific timeframe in order to measure the expertise of each member on service delivery, and only if there is a well defined a guiding purpose. However, whenever the management deems there is complexity in

task execution, which demands collaborative interactions, availability of enough and reliable resources, teams are given a priority (Gilley & Kerno Jr., 2010). In most occasions, organizations rely on teams when designing a new product or competing with other organizations in events.   Tavistock and Bertalanffy researchers' successfully handled their tasks because there was a well-defined boundary for effective information exchange (Sher, 2004), and freedom. From this perspective, a boundary is a standardized system that permits groups to adhere to their roles and only share where ideas possible. Since boundaries are defined by members of both groups, the functionality of such boundaries, as well as expected behavioural changes, are initiated by the urge to interact. Therefore, it is possible to modify negotiation terms for effective establishment of relationships among groups. Boundaries take into consideration of all forms of human attitudes and feelings: hatred, love, friendship, enmity, and commitment. The variables affect behaviour in such a way that if the leadership in control is incapacitated, boundary functionality is redefined for consistency. Conclusion Employees are the most depended upon individuals by the organization in task execution and ensuring organizational continuity. Due to their huge contributions, organizations embrace groups and teams in helping realize their goals and purpose. Since humans are social beings, the need for interaction is almost inevitable, but it is the outcome that matters in a company. Effective use of teams and groups can be beneficial to the organization and employee well being.