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Goals of this Presentation

• To spotlight a few conceptual themes emerging in the MTS research
• To argue for a stronger focus on the confluent and countervailing dynamics that can exist among intra- and inter-team processes and emergent states in MTS
A Model of Multiteam System Effectiveness
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Where Innovation Is Tradition
Multiteam Processes

- Multiteam Intra-team Processes
  - Transition
  - Action
  - Interpersonal
- Multiteam Inter-team Processes
  - Transition
  - Action
  - Interpersonal

Marks, et al., 2005; Marks, et al., 2001; DeChurch, et al., 2011; Zaccaro, & DeChurch, 2012)
Confluent and Countervailing Forces in MTSs

Where Innovation Is Tradition
Confluence Effects: Empirical Findings

• MTS transition processes explained significant incremental variance in MTS performance beyond team transition processes (Marks, et al., 2005)

• MTS action processes predict incremental variance in MTS performance beyond team action processes (Marks, et al., 2005)

• Interteam coordination explained significant incremental variance in MTS performance beyond intrateam coordination and performance (DeChurch & Marks, 2006)
Confluence Effects: Empirical Findings

• The effects of within team horizontal coordination on MTS performance are greater than the effects of between team horizontal coordination (Davision, et al., 2012)

• Between team horizontal coordination has a negative effect on MTS performance (Davision, et al., 2012)

• Within team vertical coordination has a positive effect on MTS performance (Davision, et al., 2012)
Mediated Model of Multiteam Processes and Effectiveness
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Mediated Process Effects: Empirical Findings

- Decentralized planning had negative effects on MTS performance through increased inter-team risk taking and decreased coordination (Lanaj, et al., in press)

- MTS transition processes had no effect on team level action processes (Marks, et al., 2005)
## Multiteam Emergent States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Between Team</th>
<th>MTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>Motivational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where Innovation Is Tradition
MTSs are defined as: two or more teams that interface directly and interdependently in response to environmental contingencies toward the accomplishment of collective goals. MTS boundaries are defined by virtue of the fact that all teams within the system, while pursuing different proximal goals, share at least one common distal goal; and in doing so exhibit input, process, and outcome interdependence with at least one other team in the system. In Mathieu, Marks, & Zaccaro (2001)
Mediated Model of Multiteam Processes, Emergent States and Effectiveness
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Where Innovation Is Tradition
Emergent States: Empirical Findings

Between Team
- Trust
- Efficacy
- SMM
- TMS

Between Team Info. Sharing - Openness

Between Team Info. Sharing - uniqueness

MTS Performance

Adapted from Rodríguez (2012)
Countervailing Influences in MTS

• Occurs when component team processes and emergent states are negatively related to processes and emergent states at the between-team and/or MTS level

• “Many of the factors that contribute to effective processes *within teams* may create difficulties in coordination *between teams*” (Lanaj, et al., in press, p. 3)
Motivational Countervalence

Nature of the Relationship?
- Positive
- Negative
- Curvilinear
“The data suggest that identification is an important element as MTSs coordinate their activities, but there is a lack of system identification and instead individuals rely on their strong identification with their profession, team, and organization when responding to emergencies that require multiple team coordination” (Williams, 2012, p. 71).
Leadership Countervalence

- Different leadership forms at different levels (intra-team versus inter-team versus MTS) (Carter & DeChurch, in press; Zaccaro & DeChurch, 2012)
- Different leadership functions at different levels (Carter & DeChurch, in press)
- Strong intra-team leadership can improve team performance, but hinder inter-team performance (cf. Pittinsky & Simon (2007))
Vertical between and Shared within team leadership
Shared between and vertical within team leadership
Leadership Countervalance: Empirical Findings

- MTS leader *intuitive processing* (IP) is positively associated with MTS performance; component team leader IP is negatively associated with MTS performance. (Sleesman, et al., 2012)

- MTS leader and component team leaders’ *rational processing* have compensatory effects on MTS performance (Sleesman, et al., 2012)

- MTS performance is associated with greater shared leadership among a core leader group, and greater vertical leadership between core leaders and component team members (Carter, DeChurch, & Zaccaro, 2012; Williams, 2012)
Summary

• MTS performance results from a complex interplay among integrated and segregated intra-team and inter-team processes.
• Such processes are likely to influence – and be influenced by – intra-team, inter-team, and MTS emergent states.
• Multilevel processes and emergent states in MTSs are likely to foster a mix of confluent and countervailing forces.
• MTSs are complex creatures; our research models and themes need to be correspondingly complex.
• Recent empirical studies have begun to display this complexity.

Keep it up!
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