

**Nahian Ahmed**  
**Professor. Prabhat Vaish**  
**11/13/2023**  
**Teamwork Case Study**

The article was an anecdote of a critical situation faced by Thomas Green, known as Tom. Tom recently had gotten promoted to senior marketing specialist after a year he had joined at D7 Displays. Without any doubt, Tom was able to exceed the expectations of senior management and move the feathers of mid-level employees through his bright knowledge and smart performances. However, that shiny moment was short-lived since his new boss Frank Davis had other plans for the D7 Displays self-service kiosk business. Frank's ambitions of going from 5% to 15% growth rate with extraordinary marketing strategies was the factor of disagreement between Tom and Frank. Frank wanted his employee, Tom, to have a strategic marketing strategy to create market penetration in car rentals and hotels after the heavy investments made on them by airports to buy those kiosks. While Frank was optimistic, Tom was quite pessimistic. Tom's pessimism resulted due to the fear of being eaten as lunch by web services. Tom's point of view was that web services are cheaper and more convenient for customers while self-service kiosks were hard to install and maintain unless better benefits were provided by D7 Display's kiosks that web-services cannot. He simply wanted to make software development and improvements to support his narrative. The line of conflict between Tom and Frank intensified as both of their ambitions and visions for the company did not align.

A great teamwork invests a great deal of time in shaping, exploring, and agreeing on a goal that belongs to them collectively and individually. In this case, Frank invested time in forcibly getting Tom to agree on his terms and conditions. He pulled Tom out of his current project and asked him to focus on creating better market strategy by a certain deadline. A teamwork goal is supposed to be specific, measurable, aligned, realistic, and time-bound; the D7 Displays team lacks in all of these goal factors.

There is a scenario in the article when Frank had a meeting with all of his senior position staffs where Tom interrupted him in denial of his growth plan, which Frank hated obviously. Tom argued further explaining Frank about his unrealistic growth plans supporting his point of view. While it is not easy to provide feedback to a person who is behaving inappropriately, that is why it is important to focus feedback on behavior rather than persons, focus feedback on observations rather than inferences, and focus feedback on behavior related to a specific situation. It simply frustrated Frank when Tom kept being adamant on his judgments on how competing with web-services should be the focal point rather than market penetration.

Frank Davis, being the new leader ought to own some qualities that fits the best qualities of a leader. The best qualities of a leader involve being strong, decisive, knowledgeable, supportive and cooperative. Additionally, leaders should have two concerns- production and people. Being highly concerned for people motivates them. Frank's initial email to Tom regarding how he could have done better if he was on top of his game with market data, demotivated Tom in a certain way. While Frank sounded stern with his words, a leader's best quality involves listening to his staff. Tom failed in many attempts that he took to make his leader, Frank, pay attention to his concerns and not ignore it. Frank kept emphasizing how despite the heavy competition against web-services, airports won't throw away the

heavy investments made on D7 Display's kiosks. Although Frank is right in his shoes, Tom's concerns should have been supported by Frank, as a leader since this was quite crucial. In a team, a leader should take into account what his employee's concerns are.

Any organization is based on a team despite its size and objectives. D7 Displays were working on a team following a certain chain of command like many firms and had different departments. The stages of team formation include forming, storming, norming, and performing. Frank's goals involved the performing stage, while the forming, storming, and norming was negatively impacted due to his clash with his employee, Tom. The team was not able to form due to contradictory ambitions of Tom and Frank. Frank, being the leader, should have understood and addressed Tom's concerns. This is where the team communication fell short. It was not clear to Tom to focus on a project he perceived as flawed. Therefore, the norming stage where there are shared goals, team cohesion and acceptance came into play also fell apart. This is why Tom and Frank- both was seen struggling at a storming stage where reality set in clouding both of their minds with dissatisfactions, frustrations, and adjustment anxiety. The teamwork can be best defined as a dysfunctional team as there were poor task effectiveness, poor team-member, well-being, very low team viability, low-innovation, and higher inter-team conflict.

Besides being a dysfunctional team, the D7 Displays failed to have the characteristics that are supposed to be in an effective team. An effective team accepts responsibilities and not blame one another. In this case, Frank continued blaming Tom for not achieving expectations by the deadline. Frank also questioned Tom for being in New York when he had expected Tom to be in another state, almost accusing him of putting off work. A good teamwork is based on prideful humility and a humility that assumes that other team members may well have a level of expertise that can add value to the outcome. Here, Tom was frustrated during the meeting over how his expertise in meeting clients and being in the scene was not being acknowledged enough to support his point of view.

The dynamics of team effectiveness involves psychological safety, dependability, structure and clarity, meaning, and impact. Psychological safety is where a team member feels safe to take risks in being vulnerable and taking risks in front of one another. D7 Displays succeeded in doing such since Tom portrays confidence in sharing his point of view and suggestions during meetings. The dynamics of dependability is where team members get things done on time, however, Tom had failed to be on top of his game with market data which devastated his boss, Frank. When team members have clear roles, plans, and goals then it fits the dynamic of structure and clarity. In this scenario, Tom was not in compliance with the goals of growth that were set by Frank for the company. Tom was not clarified enough on why Frank's emphasis on market penetration was more important than focusing on their biggest competitor. As a result, Tom lost track of the meaning of team dynamics. Tom was frustrated feeling like he lacked the impact dynamics of a team. Tom was unsure if his work mattered anymore since he was pulled out of his software development project.

In conclusion, the team failed brutally due to the inter-conflict of a leader and his employee which was not addressed properly and professionally.