

12-7-2010

# Probing the Relationships between Team Technology, Leadership Behaviors and Team Performance

U. Y. Eseryel

*University of Groningen, u.y.eseryel@rug.nl*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://aisel.aisnet.org/sprouts\\_all](http://aisel.aisnet.org/sprouts_all)

---

## Recommended Citation

Eseryel, U. Y., "Probing the Relationships between Team Technology, Leadership Behaviors and Team Performance" (2010). *All Sprouts Content*. 390.

[http://aisel.aisnet.org/sprouts\\_all/390](http://aisel.aisnet.org/sprouts_all/390)

This material is brought to you by the Sprouts at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in All Sprouts Content by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact [elibrary@aisnet.org](mailto:elibrary@aisnet.org).

## Probing the Relationships between Team Technology, Leadership Behaviors and Team Performance

U. Y. Eseryel  
University of Groningen, Netherlands

### Abstract

Theory of Task-Technology Fit suggests that certain types of technologies are better fit for certain technologies. Structuration theory suggests that action and organizational structures affect each other. But how do technology and structures affect each other? In other words, if we use a certain technology versus another, would it change organizational structures and therefore affect our actions? This in-process study is being conducted to answer exactly that. My research questions are: How do various types of technologies affect the leadership behaviors in virtual teams? and Is there a relationship between technology, leadership behaviors, and team performance? A study is conducted with 100 student teams, where technology and leadership are measured by surveys and team performance is measured by the group's grade on their main team assignment.

**Keywords:** Virtual teams, leadership, information technology

**Permanent URL:** <http://sprouts.aisnet.org/10-98>

**Copyright:** [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

**Reference:** Eseryel, U.Y. (2010). "Probing the Relationships between Team Technology, Leadership Behaviors and Team Performance," Proceedings > Proceedings of IFIP 8.2/Organizations and Society in Information Systems (OASIS) . *Sprouts: Working Papers on Information Systems*, 10(98). <http://sprouts.aisnet.org/10-98>

# PROBING THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEAM TECHNOLOGY, LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS AND TEAM PERFORMANCE

Eseryel, Ugur Yeliz

University of Groningen, Department of Business and ICT

**Keywords:** Virtual teams, leadership, information technology

## ABSTRACT

Theory of Task-Technology Fit suggests that certain types of technologies are better fit for certain technologies. Structuration theory suggests that action and organizational structures affect each other. But how do technology and structures affect each other? In other words, if we use a certain technology versus another, would it change organizational structures and therefore affect our actions?

This in-process study is being conducted to answer exactly that. My research question is: How do various types of technologies affect the leadership behaviors in virtual teams? Second research question is: Is there a relationship between technology, leadership behaviors, and team performance?

In this study, behavioral leadership literature will be used [1, 2]. Yukl and colleagues distinguished between task- and relationship-oriented behaviors and provided the following definitions [3]: Task-oriented behaviors are those that move the team forward in the accomplishment of its task, such as planning and scheduling work, and coordinating subordinate activities [4]. Relationship-oriented behaviors are those that allow the team to maintain a positive social environment—for example by showing trust and confidence, acting friendly and considerate, keeping subordinates informed, and providing recognition for subordinates' accomplishments" [4]. A leadership study with virtual student teams identify task coordination as an important leadership behavior [5]. However [6] shows that in other virtual teams, namely open source software (OSS) development teams, task coordination, in its traditional sense, is not even observed let alone being considered a leadership behavior. In are recent multiple case study on OSS, I observed that the nature of technologies that are available, and how they are used is quite different: OSS teams use technologies for task coordination (issue trackers) that are open to all members. Therefore each individual enters the tasks that the team should consider. They also use these technologies to assign themselves these tasks. Therefore, the technology takes on the "task coordination" behavior. Now the question is, if this observation, that tools may eliminate some important leadership behaviors, is generalizable to different contexts?

Therefore, I conduct a study with 100 student teams with 4 members. Each team is given four non-graded, yet required group assignments in order to help the group members get to know each other and feel a group environment. The assignments help the teams go through Tuckman's [7] stages of group development by means of course assignments and course rules. For example in the first two weeks, the

students are asked to form a team (forming) identify the team technologies and team norms (norming). They were also told that in cases where their colleagues do not perform, they are able to kick members out. In the first two weeks, about 10-15 of the teams changed members (storming). The teams will do one more ungraded group exercise before they are given a graded case study at the end of the semester. The technology they use, their perceived leaders and the behaviors of the perceived leaders will be captured by several surveys at the end of first, second and final task. The group performance will be measured by the final grade of the team case study assignment, which will be determined by two independent graders who will resolve discrepancies through discussion.

## REFERENCES

1. House, R.J. and R.N. Aditya, *The Social Scientific Study of Leadership: Quo Vadis?* Journal of Management, 1997. **23**(3): p. 409-473.
2. Bass, B.M., *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. 3rd ed. 1990, New York: The Free Press.
3. Yukl, G., *Leadership in organizations*. 2002, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
4. Yukl, G., A. Gordon, and T. Taber, *A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: integrating a half century of behavior research*. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 2002. **9**(1): p. 15-32.
5. Yoo, Y. and M. Alavi, *Emergent leadership in virtual teams: What do emergent leaders do?* Information and Organization, 2004. **14**: p. 27-58.
6. Crowston, K., et al., *Self-organization of teams in free/libre open source software development*. Information and Software Technology Journal, Special Issue on Qualitative Software Engineering Research, 2007. **49**(6): p. 564-575.
7. Tuckman, B.W., *Developmental sequence in small groups*. Psychological Bulletin, 1965. **63**: p. 384-99.

*Editors:*

Michel Avital, University of Amsterdam  
Kevin Crowston, Syracuse University

*Advisory Board:*

Kalle Lyytinen, Case Western Reserve University  
Roger Clarke, Australian National University  
Sue Conger, University of Dallas  
Marco De Marco, Università Cattolica di Milano  
Guy Fitzgerald, Brunel University  
Rudy Hirschheim, Louisiana State University  
Blake Ives, University of Houston  
Sirkka Jarvenpaa, University of Texas at Austin  
John King, University of Michigan  
Rik Maes, University of Amsterdam  
Dan Robey, Georgia State University  
Frantz Rowe, University of Nantes  
Detmar Straub, Georgia State University  
Richard T. Watson, University of Georgia  
Ron Weber, Monash University  
Kwok Kee Wei, City University of Hong Kong

*Sponsors:*

Association for Information Systems (AIS)  
AIM  
itAIS  
Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia  
American University, USA  
Case Western Reserve University, USA  
City University of Hong Kong, China  
Copenhagen Business School, Denmark  
Hanken School of Economics, Finland  
Helsinki School of Economics, Finland  
Indiana University, USA  
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium  
Lancaster University, UK  
Leeds Metropolitan University, UK  
National University of Ireland Galway, Ireland  
New York University, USA  
Pennsylvania State University, USA  
Pepperdine University, USA  
Syracuse University, USA  
University of Amsterdam, Netherlands  
University of Dallas, USA  
University of Georgia, USA  
University of Groningen, Netherlands  
University of Limerick, Ireland  
University of Oslo, Norway  
University of San Francisco, USA  
University of Washington, USA  
Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand  
Viktoria Institute, Sweden

*Editorial Board:*

Margunn Aanestad, University of Oslo  
Steven Alter, University of San Francisco  
Egon Berghout, University of Groningen  
Bo-Christer Bjork, Hanken School of Economics  
Tony Bryant, Leeds Metropolitan University  
Erran Carmel, American University  
Kieran Conboy, National U. of Ireland Galway  
Jan Damsgaard, Copenhagen Business School  
Robert Davison, City University of Hong Kong  
Guido Dedene, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven  
Alan Dennis, Indiana University  
Brian Fitzgerald, University of Limerick  
Ole Hanseth, University of Oslo  
Ola Henfridsson, Viktoria Institute  
Sid Huff, Victoria University of Wellington  
Ard Huizing, University of Amsterdam  
Lucas Introna, Lancaster University  
Panos Ipeirotis, New York University  
Robert Mason, University of Washington  
John Mooney, Pepperdine University  
Steve Sawyer, Pennsylvania State University  
Virpi Tuunainen, Helsinki School of Economics  
Francesco Virili, Università degli Studi di Cassino

*Managing Editor:*

Bas Smit, University of Amsterdam

*Office:*

Sprouts  
University of Amsterdam  
Roetersstraat 11, Room E 2.74  
1018 WB Amsterdam, Netherlands  
Email: admin@sprouts.aisnet.org