

Disclaimer: This information is made available as a service to the public but has not been edited or approved by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. The content is the responsibility of the authors.

Teamwork and its contribution to High Performance Workplace Organization

This is the German contribution to the topic report on teamwork and its contribution to High Performance Workplace Organisation for the European Working Conditions Observatory (EWCO).

Q.0 Firstly, the correspondents are asked to describe shortly the surveys (dates, coverage, size and response rates, in case of qualitative surveys the leading methodology) used in answering the questions. Correspondents are asked to report on relevant available surveys such as:

Q.0.1 working conditions national representative surveys (quantitative methodology)

To keep this category, the national representativeness is the most important criterion. The population surveyed might be employees, employers, HR specialists, social representatives etc.

GSOEP

The [GSOEP](#) is a wide-ranging representative longitudinal study of private households in Germany. It provides information on all household members, consisting of Germans living in the Old and New German States, Foreigners, and recent Immigrants to Germany. The Panel was started in 1984 and is conducted annually. In 2003, there were more than 12,000 households, and nearly 24,000 persons sampled.

The GSOEP provides a broad information on diverse aspects of household composition, occupational biographies, employment, earnings, health and satisfaction indicators.

Subjects covered in topical modules of the survey are personal values, preferences and expectations, social security, education and training, and allocation of time.

The GSOEP is located at the [German Institute for Economic Research \(DIW\)](#).

Data from the GSOEP was used for the [European Community Household Panel \(ECHP\)](#) and for the Community Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) launched for Germany in 2005.

(Abbreviation: GSOEP)

BIBB/IAB/BAuA surveys

The BIBB/IAB surveys are representative surveys of 34,000 people employed. The surveys have been conducted jointly by the [Federal Institute for Vocation Education and Training \(BIBB\)](#) and the [Institute for Employment Research \(IAB\)](#) operating as the [Federal Employment Services'](#) research institution. The surveys have been funded by the [Federal Ministry for Education and Research](#). The first BIBB/IAB survey took place in 1979. Further surveys were conducted in 1995/86 and 1991/92. Each of the four survey had a specific topic.

The fourth and last survey took place in 1998/1999. In the survey, the [Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health \(FIOSH, German acronym BAuA\)](#) participated also.

The aim of the survey was to shed light on the structural change in the working world and the impact on working conditions and the individual mobility behaviour of employed people. In the survey detailed information on the qualification profiles and the occupational developments as well as the organisational, technological and qualification frame condition of their working place had been gathered.

A new [BIBB/BAuA](#) survey as a joint survey of the [Federal Institute for Vocation Education and Training \(BIBB\)](#) and the [Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health \(FIOSH, German acronym BAuA\)](#) is currently conducted (<http://www.bibb.de/de/21767.htm>). New features of the BIBB/BAuA 2005/2006 survey are:

- CATI instead of CAPI survey
- 15,000 instead of 34,000 people employed.

(Abbreviation: BIBB/IAB98/99 and BIBB/BAuA 2005/2006)

Adhoc survey 'What is good work?'

Within the [Initiative New Quality of Work \(INQA\)](#) [INIFES](#) conducted an [adhoc survey](#) on the issue 'What is good work? Requirements from the perspective of employed people'. The population of the representative survey conducted end of 2004 are gainfully employed people. The sample consist of 5,200 persons. The [Questionnaire](#) focuses on quality of work-related issues.

(Abbreviation: Adhoc)

Q.0.2 other establishment of company surveys (quantitative methodology - e.g. larger sample of employees; structured questionnaire used)

This category of surveys differs form the previous one by national representativeness. The survey sample is often constituted by employees of one company only.

The IAB-Betriebspanel (Company panel)

The [IAB-Betriebspanel](#) is a [representative employer survey](#) on company level data on employment conducted by the [Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung IAB](#)). The IAB is the research institute of the Federal Employment Office ([Bundesagentur für Arbeit](#)). The survey takes place annually since 1993 in West Germany and 1996 in East Germany within the same companies. The [number of companies](#) increased over the years from 4,265 up to almost 16,000 companies of all sectors and sizes. The [themes](#) cover all questions around employment. In each annual wave a key theme is investigated. For reasons of data protection the (raw) data is not publicly available.

(Abbreviation: IAB)

Q.0.3 qualitative studies (at different levels)

Studies where qualitative methods have been used to understand teamwork and its consequences.

A study conducted by the [Sociological Research Institute at the University of Göttingen \(SOFI\)](#) carried out a study (Kuhlmann, M., Sperling, H. and S Balzert 2004) on [Concepts of](#)

[an innovative work policy](#). This study provides insights into work practices and effects. The research was funded by the [Federal Ministry for Education and Research](#) within the framework of the research programme [Innovative work structuring - the future of work](#). ([DE0407NU05](#))

The study is based on qualitative company case studies in the engineering, electrical goods, automobile and chemical sectors. The studies included:

- work analysis;
- interviews with representatives of different job functions at all levels;
- interviews with works councils;
- interviews with employees in addition to a standardised written questionnaire.

The selection criteria for the companies was their experience in conceptualising and implementing innovative work forms. They are typical good-practice cases rather than exceptionally successful cases.

(Abbreviation: SOFI)

Note: Please label each survey with abbreviation which will be used when answering next sections of questionnaire to indicate the source survey.

Secondly, the structure of most of the questions will be very similar. Each question is divided into three sections (each section has its own box). Your answers are supposed to be jot down into particular boxes.

- **BOX 1 Question wordings**- (question formulations from already existing survey instruments)
- **BOX 2 Content and main findings – national representative surveys**
(the data from the national representative surveys on working conditions or teamwork in particular)
- **BOX 3 Content and main findings – other company surveys, qualitative research** (including case studies)
(The data from company level surveys, qualitative company case studies or other qualitative research)

Explanation of the questionnaire structure:

The aim of this questionnaire structure is to give you a room for answers from different sources. As we are seeking for information about issues that are usually not very well covered in most working conditions surveys, we thought it was useful to leave space for other research findings and build out questionnaire in this way. You might feel concerned about not being able to respond all the questions. Please bear in mind that we are obliged for any information you provide us.

It means that **when there is a very good coverage of the issue by quantitative data from national representative surveys you are NOT required to search for additional information in qualitative studies (BOX 3)!** The third box (complementary information) is optional and/or complementary. But we would appreciate if you would include at least one case study from your country in the answers.

However, we are well aware that it is very difficult to capture some of the following issues by national representative quantitative data both because of the nature of the issue and also because of scarce occurrence of these questions in national representative surveys. If it is your

case please keep in mind **to stress importance of the third box** “Content and main findings – company surveys, qualitative case studies or other qualitative research ” where **expert opinion** and **synthesis** of existing qualitative studies are required. Outputs of qualitative research should provide you a room firstly for describing the topic in situation when no quantitative data are available or secondly to complete the information when you find it relevant.

Q.1 National correspondents are asked to give question wordings and figures which deal with the incidence of teamwork in their countries.

Example:

- *“Do you work in permanent work group or team that has common tasks and possibility to plan its work?”*
- *Does your job involve, or not...? “Doing all or part of your work in a team”*
- *Does your job involve, or not...? “Rotating tasks between yourself and colleagues”*
- *“At my work I have opportunity to be in touch with my colleagues by means of team work”*

Question wordings (Q.1a)

National representative surveys and quantitative case studies: We are interested how national representative surveys and quantitative case studies cover incidence of teamwork in the country or in particular company. Correspondents are asked to give relevant existing question wordings to this issue.

The following survey questionnaires have been analysed. There have not been any such questions in the GSOEP [Questionnaires](#): (1997 -2005) and in the BIBB-IAB survey 1998/1999. For the *BIBB/BAuA 2005/2006* only an [overview on questions](#) is available. The The INIFES – Adhoc survey ([Questionnaire](#)) does not include any relevant question.

Content and main findings – national representative surveys (Q.1.b)

Correspondents are asked to give figures on the issue of **extent of teamwork** from national representative quantitative surveys. Please give figures broken down by gender, occupation, sector, company size (0-49; 50-249,250 and more employees), educational attainment, type of ownership. If trend is available please give the trend data with a brief commentary.

Content and main findings – company surveys, case studies or other qualitative research (Q.1.c)

Correspondents are asked to give the main findings emerging from the most recent case studies on the issue of **the extent of teamwork** (the summary and expert reflexion of existing case studies on that issue is required).

The IAB establishment panel [questionnaires 2004; 2003; 2002; 2001; 2000; 1999; 1998; 1997](#) have been analysed.

The 2004 questionnaire includes a question 'Which of the following changes are the most important from your perspective? One of the options is: introduction of team work/self-managed teams?

The 2000 and 1998 questionnaire include a question 'Have one or several of the following

changes of work organisation been performed ...? On of the options is: introduction of team work/self-managed teams?

Q.2 Do in the national representative surveys or other surveys exist questions dealing with form and organisation of the team?

Example:

- If you have opportunity to work in team, what is its usual form?

Flexible teams build up to solve particular project or problem.

Teamwork in a simple form of job rotation without having opportunity to decide about methods of work or task.

Please include also data if available about incidence of different types of teamwork such as: **quality circles** (exmp. „Do in your company exist so called QUALITY CIRCLES, where the room to express your ideas to particular work issues is given to employees?, **virtual teams** („Do you use computers or other electronic devices to organize group work or for consultation of your work tasks. “), **cross functional teams** (“Do you cooperate with other departments within interdisciplinary work on particular projects or work tasks?”)

Question wordings (Q.2.a)

National representative surveys and quantitative case studies: We are interested how national representative surveys and quantitative case studies cover **form and organization of the team**. Correspondents are asked to give relevant existing question wordings to this issue.

The IAB establishment panel [questionnaires 2004](#); [2003](#); [2002](#); [2001](#); [2000](#); [1999](#); [1998](#); [1997](#) have been analysed.

In 2003, 1999 and 1997, questions in relation to further training deal with team work related issues. The questions is: For which of the following internal or external measures have employees been released from work, respectively the cost entirely or partially been covered by the company?

Two options (out of 8) are: job rotation and quality circles etc.

In the 1997 survey, a further question follows: Will the following single forms of company further training gain or lose importance? Or will there be no changes? One out of seven options is 'job rotation' and another one 'quality circles'.

The 2002 survey which focussed particularly on older workers includes a question: 'Please tell me to each of the characteristics if they are more prevalent in the case of younger or of older workers:

Response options are:

a) characteristic is for the majority of the workplaces:

- very important
- important
- less important?

b) characteristic can be found more likely in the case of

- younger workers
- no difference
- more likely for older workers.

Another question is: Which of the following measures orientated towards the employment of older workers are applied in your company? One options is: age-mixed composition of work groups?

The 2000 questionnaire includes a similar question related to age-mixed teams. Respondent shall tell which of a number of statements on older workers apply or not. One of 6 statements is: It is useful to employ older and younger employees together in age-mixed teams.

In the 2001 questionnaire a question in the context of further training is: Where had in the first half year of 2001 been the key themes of further training? The respondent shall give the most important and the second important theme.

One out of five options is: Social competence (e.g. ability to work as a part of a team, conflict management, work organisation)?

The Adhoc survey includes: How important is it for you that there are regular group and department meeting, in order to discuss problems, critique, successful work procedures?

Content and main findings – national representative surveys (Q.2.b)

Correspondents are asked to give figures on the issue of **form and organization of the team** from national representative quantitative surveys. What is the incidence of different types of teamwork? Which types of teamwork are characteristic for different occupations, sectors, company size or type of ownership?

Content and main findings –company surveys, case studies or other qualitative research (Q.2.c)

Correspondents are asked to give the main findings emerging from the case studies or qualitative research on the issue of **form and organization of the team**. What is the incidence of different types of teamwork? Which types of teamwork are characteristic for different occupations, sectors, company size or type of ownership? (summary and expert reflexion of existing case studies on that issue is required).

The SOFI study gives insights in preconditions, practices and impact of the innovative work policy that combines an improvement in work organisation and working conditions with increased productivity.

The SOFI study defines 'Innovative work policy' as a company approach to achieve its economic objectives by means of a work organisation that broadens the competencies of different groups of employees, and promotes professional and social cooperation among staff. It is understood as a means of improving working conditions, developing human resources and giving workers a role in shaping work processes.

The study focuses on the impact of innovative work forms for the employees and the approach is to extend research on team work by issues such as process optimisation,

leadership, and payment systems. The key research interest is in ambivalences and internal contradiction of new forms of work.

Innovative work policy is understood as an approach of companies to achieve their economic objectives based on process-orientated work and organisation forms that broaden the competencies of different groups of employees, promote professional and social capacity of cooperation and imply an improvement of the work situation for the employees. It is seen as an approach of developing human resources and offering more rights to a share in decisions to the workers regarding the shaping of work processes. The study covers different distinctive process and sector features.

The study verifies results of previous studies that the impact of team work on the work situation depends on the particular realisation and implementation. The features of the design of team work i.e. task and functional integration and team self organisation are fundamental for a negative or positive dynamic of inherent ambivalences of team work.

A clear interrelation exists between the arrangement of work organisation and the experience of the work situation. Especially on a high level of implementation positive balance of reorganisation experiences prevails whereas a contracting picture characterises a low level of implementation.

A positive judgement of team work by workers is based on extended task and function responsibilities and increased opportunities of cooperation. Self-organised functional integrated team work gains even by the integration of indirect functions, extended task and systematic rotation solution self-organised by the teams. This leads to more positive work experiences and improved opportunities to regulate strain. These positive effects are reinforced by the chance and the necessity of improved cooperation.

Ambivalence arise from intensified performance demands and widened responsibilities of the work teams. In this context, the crucial aspects are the question how performance demands are defined and the employee participation in the determination of performance goals. The researchers emphasise an interaction between different components of innovative work policy.

A further ambivalence is that: within certain limits the teams are now responsible themselves for demanding performance and for bringing about internal performance justice. The strength of the ambivalences are seen as correlated with the different forms of implementation of innovative work concepts. In contrast to other studies, the researchers did not identify tendencies of increased self-exploitation.

Crucial for the good practice of innovative work concepts regarding work organisation that the groups do not only have task tailored that allow a change of work effort but also the opportunity to organise work themselves within the team and that forms of social support take effect.

Besides classical aspects of work sociology such as work profile, completeness of tasks, and extent of disposition scope the social quality of team processes are significantly relevant for the question how far the ambivalences inherent in this form of work organisation have a negative impact.

A core thesis is that aspects of team self organisation [Gruppenselbstorganisation] such as status and role of the team spokesperson, arrangement and nature of team discussions as the opportunities of cooperation are decisive for negative or positive dynamics.

With self-organised team work a new ambivalence potential emerges with a negative impact in case of insufficient team self regulation. A general scepticism towards work forms of extended team self-regulated had not been observed. In contrast, most of the employees criticised promises not kept to and restrictions of self-regulation imposed by the company as frequently observed phenomenon.

Across all the case studies the project detects a clear pattern of connection between impact on the work situation and the range of team work regulation / arrangement.

In respect of this general effect of innovative work organisation no branch-specific differences are evident.

As résumé the researcher formulate a few principle of contours of good practices in the area of innovative work policy:

- widely tailored tasks and opportunities of rotation;
- integration of indirect functions;
- guaranteed institutionalisation of team self-regulation and provision of appropriate resources.

In particular the last aspect is central.

Regarding leadership in the context of innovative work policy the key aspects are:

- delegation of operative detailed control task to the production groups;
- enhancement of the first leadership level based on extension of the range of functions;
- changing role of leadership: agreement instead of instructions;
- perspectives of occupational developments for master craftspersons (Meister) instead of replacing them by engineers.

Key factors of payment systems are:

- incentives for gaining competence and work flexibility;
- group reference;
- the right to a share in determining performance goals;
- wide understanding of performance including quantitative and qualitative goals.

With regard to important aspects the results of the research project are in line with the debate on high-performance work systems. This applies in particular to the 'coherence thesis'. In the centre of the coherence thesis is the observation, that different dimensions of establishment are closely interconnected. The key issues are the integration of work organisation and team work with general aspect of company organisation, payment systems; pay and performance determination and that different aspects reorganisation promote a process optimisation actively supported by the employees. The significance of coherence in reorganisation became evident in the case studies in the context of friction in the implementation process of the concepts.

Q.3 Does teamwork increase autonomy of employees in decision making about their work? Which degrees of self-regulation can be distinguished?

Example:

- *The teams are responsible for the preparing and supporting activities of their own work.*
- *The group can self set the targets for its work.*

- *The members of my team are responsible for determining the methods, procedures, and schedules with which the work gets done.*
- *Team is responsible for the results but the team is under the external control.*
- *Members of team do not have particular responsibility for results and group is managed from external sources as a unit.*

Please give also figures showing association between teamwork and individual worker's autonomy. In this respect crosstabs of autonomy (YES/NO) and teamwork (YES/NO) are required.

Question wordings (Q.3.a)

National representative surveys and quantitative case studies: We are interested how national representative surveys and quantitative case studies cover autonomy of members in a team (See examples above). Correspondents are asked to give relevant question wordings to this issue.

Content and main findings – national representative surveys (Q.3.b)

Correspondents are asked to give figures on the issue of autonomy in a team eventually autonomy at work from national representative quantitative surveys (crosstabs are preferred, correlations, other reported associations).

Content and main findings – case studies or other qualitative research (Q.3.c)

Correspondents are asked to give the main findings emerging from case studies or qualitative research on the issue of teamwork and autonomy. We are interested in to what extent the growth in autonomy within the team results in better group performance and higher job satisfaction (the summary and expert reflexion of existing case studies on that issue is required).

Q.4. To what extent are workers satisfied with team based way of working? Can you also report on association between overall job satisfaction and teamwork presence? Does teamwork increase overall job satisfaction?

Example:

- *Are you generally satisfied with team based way of working*
- *How satisfied are you with your job?*

Question wordings (Q.4.a)

National representative surveys and quantitative case studies: We are interested how national representative surveys and quantitative case studies cover satisfaction with teamwork. Correspondents are asked to give relevant question wordings to this issue.

Content and main findings – national representative surveys (Q.4.b)

If direct question on satisfaction with teamwork is available, please give the figures. Correspondents are also asked to give figures on the issue of teamwork (YES/NO) and job satisfaction (SATISFIED/NOT SATISFIED) from national representative quantitative surveys (crosstabs are preferred, correlations, other reported associations).

Content and main findings – case studies or other qualitative research (Q.4.c)

Correspondents are asked to give the main findings emerging from the most recent case studies or qualitative research on the issue of teamwork and job satisfaction (the summary and expert reflexion of existing case studies on that issue is required)

Q.5 Does in your country exist any evidence about interconnection between teamwork presence and higher work intensity and probable work overload?

Please report on the results from any available sources (both of qualitative and quantitative nature).

Example of direct questions related to that issue:

- *“Working in group is much more demanding than working individually”*
- *“Work pressure becomes evenly distributed in the group”*
- *“Nearly all the members of my team contribute equally to the work”*
- *“The number of people in my team is too small for the work to be accomplished.”*

Question wordings (Q.5.a)

National representative surveys and quantitative case studies: We are interested how national representative surveys and quantitative case studies cover the problems of interconnection between teamwork introduction and higher work intensity and higher stress exposure. Correspondents are asked to give relevant question wordings to this issue.

Content and main findings – national representative surveys (Q.5.b)

Correspondents are asked to give figures on the issue of interconnection between teamwork introduction and higher work intensity and higher stress exposure from national representative quantitative surveys. Please use both figures from direct questions and also figures from higher level analysis e.g. teamwork (YES/NO), higher risk of stress occurrence (YES/NO) (crosstabs are preferred, correlations, other reported associations).

Content and main findings – case studies or other qualitative research (Q.5.c)

Correspondents are asked to give the main findings emerging from case studies or qualitative research on the issue of teamwork and higher exposure to overload and stress. Is the work intensity or pace of work higher within organisations which have introduced the work in teams? (the summary and expert reflexion of existing case studies on that issue is required)

The SOFI study demonstrated that negative experiences can also arise due to intensified performance demands, internal competition from within the team, and greater responsibilities. On the other hand, the research did not identify tendencies of work overload among individual team members.

Q.6 What is the impact of teamwork on learning environment in organization?

In this question we are following the assumption that teamwork is creating environment for shared responsibility, knowledge and both continuous professional and personal development. We are interested in learning and professional growth opportunities of employees working in team in comparison to the other workers.

When answering this question you should also focus on the job enrichment and job enlargement phenomenon of working life.

Question wordings (Q.6.a)

National representative surveys and quantitative case studies: We are interested how national representative surveys and quantitative case studies cover the problems mentioned above. Correspondents are asked to give relevant question wordings to this issue.

Content and main findings – national representative surveys (Q.6.b)

Correspondents are asked to give figures on the issue of interconnection of teamwork and learning opportunities from national representative quantitative surveys. Do team members use the opportunity to enhance their professional skills in workplace training more than other employees working in different organizational structures? (crosstabs are preferred, correlations, other reported associations).

Content and main findings – case studies or other qualitative research (Q.6.c)

Correspondents are asked to give the main findings emerging from case studies or other qualitative research on the issue of teamwork and learning. We are interested in what is the extent of sharing the knowledge within the team. Do employees working in teams have better opportunities to learn new things in the job than other workers?" "Is learning environment within team more stimulating?" (the summary and expert reflexion of existing case studies on that issue is required)

(Q.6.d)

It is assumed that teamwork contributes positively to job enrichment and job enlargement (for definition and concept see page n. 8).As these two job characteristics consists of different attributes of work and cannot be measured directly, they must be operationalised. **Can you**

find in your national studies (both quantitative and qualitative) any reported association between teamwork, job enrichment and job enlargement?

Q.7 Team effectiveness subjectively perceived

It is probable that when answering this question you will be very limited and there will be no question wordings in representative surveys. For all that we can find at least some evidence how workers assess productivity of company or particular department after being involved in the teamwork (See an example).

Example:

- How well the following statements describe your group work? Productiveness of work improves in group work.

Question wordings (Q.7.a)

National representative surveys and quantitative case studies: We are interested how national representative surveys and quantitative case studies cover the problems what is the impact of teamwork introduction on team effectiveness (from the subjective point of view). Correspondents are asked to give relevant question wordings to this issue.

The IAB establishment panel questionnaire [2001](#) deals with reasons to the introduction of work groups. The first question is: Have in the last two years one or more of the following organisational changes taken place? The respondents can reply with regard to realised changes and most important changes. One of the reply options is: introduction of work groups/self-managed teams.

The next question is: Why did you carry out the most important change.

Two out of five options are relevant:

- as a consequence of previous organisational changes?
- to improve productivity/flexibility?

Content and main findings – national representative surveys (Q.7.b)

Correspondents are asked to give figures on the issue what is the impact of teamwork introduction on team effectiveness subjectively perceived (crosstabs are preferred, correlations, other reported associations).

Content and main findings – case studies or other qualitative research (Q.7.c)

Correspondents are asked to give the main findings emerging from case studies or other qualitative research on the issue of team effectiveness subjectively perceived (the summary and expert reflexion of existing case studies on that issue is required).

The SOFI study concludes organising the work situation in an integrated and innovative manner can have a positive effect on team work. Work organisation and team work are identified as being closely linked to the overall aspects of company organisation and work policy. There is an interrelation between different components of innovative work policy, including work organisation, reshuffling of leadership, and payment systems tailored to team work.

The manner in which team work is implemented is the key in detecting the impact of team

work. The study identified a positive impact of a high degree of team work on work organisation. There will only be positive dynamic regarding team work when key features of work organisation are in place. Autonomy in the team and the opportunities to organise and rotate the necessary tasks and function within their area of responsibility are the key fundamentals for the success of team work. These conditions lead to more positive work experiences, improved cooperation and better opportunities to manage work pressures.

Crucial for a successful outcome are key characteristics of team self-organisation such as the status and role of the team spokesperson, the planning and content of team discussions, and opportunities for cooperation. On the other hand, insufficient team organisation and autonomy can generate a sense of uncertainty among workers.

All work forms that allow greater autonomy among teams are regarded as positive. However, most employees pointed to restrictions imposed by management to the team's independence.

In all the case studies, the impact on the work situation was interrelated with the extent of team work. Important elements of a positive impact of team work are a wide range of tasks, offering opportunities for work rotation, integrating indirect functions within the remit of the team, guaranteeing the autonomy of the team and providing appropriate resources.

Regarding the diffusion of innovative work policy three complexes of condition have been distinguished in the study:

- Innovative work policy requires a multifaceted restructuring linking several aspects of hierarchy and work processes on several levels. Otherwise problems will occur based on status and power conflicts.
- Ambivalences and dilemmas of work policy strategies have to be dealt with.
- Innovative work policy is a reorganisation concept build on preconditions: it starts at several levels and requires broad coalitions of company actors and an integrated approach. The researchers emphasise the crucial role of employee representations in this context.

Q.8 Please reflect briefly on the existing governmental documents, policies, programs or social partners agreements discussing implementation of new work organization forms with emphasis on teamwork at national level.

The [Federal Ministry for Education and Research](#) had a research programme [Innovative work structuring - the future of work](#) some years ago. Within this programme the SOFI study on team work had been financed. This programme had been replaced by a new programme [Innovation capability in a modern working world \(Programme\)](#). This programme also integrates results from research on learning in the work process stemming from the programme 'Culture of learning competence development'. The Ministry emphasises an integrated approach of company organisation.

A [position](#) by the German Confederation of Trade Unions (DGB) mentions capability of working in a team and team work itself in the context of an 'extended definition of innovation' going beyond an understanding of innovation focussed on technologies.

A [documentation](#) of a conference on innovation published by the DGB presents a company example (Sartorius AG, Göttingen) of successful implementation of team work as a good practice example.

In the context of work organisation the Confederation of German Employers' Associations (BDA) discusses teamwork in a brief [position](#) on work organisation. The BDA emphasises

that teamwork and other managerial tools should be embedded in an approach of an integrated production system as practiced successfully in the car industry.

An analysis from 1999 (Kamp 1999) for the Hans-Böckler-Foundation gives an overview on company agreements on group/team work. The book analyses the role of teams, their autonomy, targets for the work of the team, tasks of the team, work organisation, competencies of the team, regulations on qualifications and training measures, role of the group speaker.

References

Federal Ministry for Education and Research, BMBF-Förderprogramm Innovationsfähigkeit in einer modernen Arbeitswelt, Berlin, 2005.

http://www.bmbf.de/pub/innovationsfaehigkeit_in_einer_moderner_arbeitswelt.pdf

INIFES, 2004, Erste Ergebnisse der Umfrage 'Was ist gute Arbeit? – Anforderungen aus der Sicht der Erwerbstätigen, INQA - Was ist gute Arbeit? - Anforderungen aus der Sicht von Erwerbstätigen (<http://www.inqa.de/Inqa/Redaktion/Projekte/Was-ist-gute-Arbeit/erste-ergebnisse.property=pdf,bereich=inqa,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf>)

Kamp, L. Gruppenarbeit, Analyse und Handlungsempfehlungen, edition der Hans Böckler Stiftung, Düsseldorf 1999

Kuhlmann, M., Sperling, H. J. and Balzert, S., Konzepte innovativer Arbeitspolitik: Good-Practice-Beispiele aus dem Maschinenbau, der Automobil-, Elektro- und Chemischen Industrie, Sigma, Berlin 2004.

Nordhause-Janz, J. and U. Pekruhl, (eds.), Arbeiten in neuen Strukturen? Partizipation, Kooperation, Autonomie und Gruppenarbeit in Deutschland, München/Mering, Rainer Hampp Verlag 2000.

Pekruhl, U., Macht Gruppenarbeit glücklich? Arbeitsstrukturen, Belastungssituation und Arbeitszufriedenheit von Beschäftigten, in: Nordhause-Janz, J. and U. Pekruhl, (eds.), Arbeiten in neuen Strukturen?, 173-201

Anni Weiler, AWWW GmbH ArbeitsWelt – Working world