

The Teamwork Framework: An Organised, Rational, and Knowledge-Driven Model of Collaborative Performance

Bernard Osahon Odiase

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences
University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria
For correspondence, email: osasben04@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Teamwork remains a central construct in contemporary organisational scholarship; however, many existing models emphasise relational cohesion or behavioural interaction while giving comparatively less attention to the structural, rational and epistemic foundations of collective performance. Addressing this gap, this paper introduces the Odiase Teamwork Framework as a conceptual model for understanding organised and knowledge-oriented collaboration in organisational settings. Drawing on literature from organisational learning, knowledge-based theory of the firm, dynamic capabilities and team effectiveness research, the framework conceptualises teamwork as a structured system in which coordinated roles, procedural alignment and shared knowledge resources influence collective outcomes. Structurally, the framework differs from many established teamwork models by explicitly integrating organisational structure, knowledge management processes and evidence-informed decision mechanisms into the architecture of team functioning. It outlines eight interconnected dimensions that emphasise role clarity, task coordination, information sharing, learning integration and accountability mechanisms within teams. Rather than focusing primarily on interpersonal cohesion or psychological dynamics, the model positions teamwork as an institutionalised process embedded within organisational routines and knowledge systems. The paper situates the framework in relation to existing teamwork literature and discusses its possible relevance across organisational leadership, educational management, public service delivery and small and medium-sized enterprises. In addition, directions for future research are proposed, including empirical validation, measurement scale development and comparative studies across organisational contexts. The framework therefore offers a conceptual perspective that links collaboration with organisational structure and knowledge integration, contributing to ongoing discussions on how teams function in complex institutional environments.

Keywords: Teamwork; Organisational learning; Knowledge integration; Evidence-based management; Dynamic capabilities

INTRODUCTION

Teamwork has become a defining feature of contemporary organisational life, not merely as a managerial slogan but as an operational necessity. Organisations today function within environments characterised by volatility, technological disruption and intensified interdependence across functional, geographic and institutional boundaries. The diffusion of digital platforms, the rise of knowledge-intensive work and the acceleration of global competition have collectively altered the architecture of work, rendering isolated individual performance increasingly insufficient. Contemporary teamwork research underscores that effective collaboration is central to innovation, adaptability and sustained organisational performance (Salas et al., 2018; Mathieu et al., 2019). Similarly, strategic management scholarship emphasises that competitive advantage is progressively rooted in coordinated capabilities rather than discrete competencies (Teece, 2018). In this regard, teamwork is not peripheral but foundational to how modern organisations create, integrate and deploy value.

Notwithstanding extensive scholarship, the conceptual terrain of teamwork remains fragmented. A significant proportion of models privilege interpersonal cohesion, trust and affective integration, often treating structural design and decision architecture as secondary considerations (Mathieu et al., 2019; Salas et al., 2018). While such perspectives illuminate important relational dynamics, they frequently under-specify how teams should be systematically organised, how rationality should guide collective judgement, and how knowledge resources ought to be deliberately orchestrated to enhance performance outcomes. Organisational performance studies increasingly indicate that structural alignment, decision quality and learning capability are critical mediators between collaboration and measurable results (Aguinis & Burgi-Tian, 2021; Jiang & Messersmith, 2018). Yet these dimensions are rarely integrated within a unified conceptual framework of teamwork. The consequence is a proliferation of models that illuminate isolated aspects of collaboration but offer limited integrative guidance for complex, multi-layered organisational contexts.

Furthermore, strategic management literature has progressively shifted towards dynamic capability, ambidexterity and knowledge-based perspectives, all of which underscore the importance of coordinated, rational and learning-oriented collective action (Teece, 2018; Felin et al., 2015). However, the translation of these macro-level insights into micro- and meso-level teamwork frameworks remains incomplete. Existing teamwork theories are often developed within relatively homogeneous corporate or military environments and may not sufficiently account for institutional diversity, public sector constraints or emerging economy realities (Zoogah et al., 2015). Consequently, there is a conceptual gap between teamwork as a relational construct and teamwork as an organised, decision-driven and knowledge-enabled system.

In response, this paper advances the Odiase TEAMWORK framework (Odiase, 2026) as an integrative conceptual model that reconceptualises teamwork as an organised, rational and knowledge-driven process. Rather than positioning collaboration solely within affective or social domains, the framework synthesises structural coordination, decision logic and epistemic mobilisation within a coherent architecture. By situating teamwork at the intersection of

organisational design, strategic rationality and knowledge integration, the model seeks to address conceptual fragmentation in existing literature and contribute a theoretically anchored perspective capable of informing both scholarly inquiry and practice across diverse organisational settings.

Statement of the Problem / Research Gaps

Notwithstanding the maturity of teamwork scholarship, significant conceptual imbalances persist. A substantial proportion of extant research concentrates on interpersonal dynamics—such as cohesion, trust, communication patterns and psychological safety—as primary determinants of team effectiveness (Edmondson & Lei, 2014; Mathieu et al., 2019; Salas et al., 2018). While these contributions have generated valuable insights, they have also contributed to a predominantly socio-affective framing of teamwork. Comparatively less attention has been directed towards the structural configuration of teams, the architecture of collective decision-making, and the systematic coordination of tasks within complex organisational systems (Burke et al., 2016; Humphrey & Aime, 2014). In parallel, strategic management literature has advanced robust discussions on rationality, dynamic capabilities and competitive advantage (Teece, 2018), yet these macro-level constructs are rarely translated into integrated models of team-level functioning. Consequently, teamwork is often theorised as a relational phenomenon detached from the structural and decision-logical mechanisms that underpin sustainable organisational performance.

Moreover, although knowledge management and organisational learning research emphasise knowledge integration, transactive memory systems and collective learning processes (Nonaka et al, 2020; Ren & Argote, 2011), these streams are frequently developed in isolation from mainstream teamwork models. The fragmentation between relational, structural and epistemic perspectives has produced a body of literature that is rich yet compartmentalised. Few conceptual frameworks explicitly synthesise organisational design, rational decision architecture and knowledge mobilisation within a single, coherent model of teamwork. Despite extensive scholarship on team cohesion, communication and trust, limited attention has been given to the integrative alignment of organisational structure, rational decision architecture and knowledge-driven collaboration within a unified framework. This omission constrains theoretical advancement and limits the development of context-sensitive models capable of addressing the complexity of contemporary organisations, particularly within public sector and emerging economy settings where structural constraints and knowledge asymmetries are pronounced (Zoogah et al., 2015).

Development of the TEAMWORK Framework and Theoretical Anchoring of its Dimensions

Framework Development Process

The TEAMWORK framework was developed through a systematic conceptual synthesis of organisational behaviour, team effectiveness, and knowledge management literature. The constructs included in the framework were derived from recurring theoretical themes identified

Odiase. The teamwork framework: an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven model

in prior scholarship on collaborative performance, organisational learning, dynamic capabilities and knowledge integration. Specifically, the development process involved three stages.

First, an extensive literature review was conducted across key domains including team effectiveness research, knowledge-based theory of the firm, organisational learning theory and coordination theory. This review revealed that most teamwork models emphasise relational dynamics such as cohesion and communication, while comparatively fewer frameworks integrate structural coordination, knowledge utilisation and decision rationality as core determinants of team performance. Second, the conceptual categories identified in the literature were analytically clustered into eight constructs that represent the structural, behavioural and cognitive foundations of collaborative work. These constructs collectively form the TEAMWORK framework. Third, relationships among these constructs were theoretically specified based on existing empirical and theoretical evidence in the teamwork literature. These relationships are expressed in the form of testable theoretical propositions, enabling the framework to be examined empirically in future studies.

Through this process, the TEAMWORK framework emerged not as a mnemonic device but as a conceptual model specifying antecedent conditions, mediating mechanisms and organisational outcomes of effective teamwork.

Construct Definitions

Together (T): Structured Collaborative Synergy

Within the TEAMWORK framework, *Together* is not a sentimental exhortation to harmony, nor is it merely a function of physical proximity. Rather, it represents a deliberately engineered system of interdependence, grounded in a shared purpose and coordinated responsibility. Togetherness is intentional, designed through the clear articulation of collective objectives, well-defined roles, and systematic linkage of tasks so that individual skills and contributions are aligned with overarching team outcomes. Social interdependence theory emphasises that when team members perceive their success as inherently connected to the success of others, cooperative behaviour is both more consistent and more effective (Johnson & Johnson, 2019; Deutsch, 2018). This principle underpins the TEAMWORK framework's view that collective performance is strongest when goal interdependence is deliberately structured, rather than relying on informal or emergent cooperation (Mathieu et al., 2019; Salas et al., 2018). Empirical studies further demonstrate that clearly defined coordination mechanisms, coupled with explicit performance expectations, significantly enhance team output and efficiency in complex task environments (Lee et al., 2019; Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2021).

Beyond its theoretical grounding, togetherness carries profound strategic significance. Effective collaboration requires transparency in communication, shared understanding of standards, and clarity regarding expectations; absent these elements, calls for unity risk collapsing into superficial collegiality that adds little value. Research on collective efficacy underscores that shared confidence in the team's capability enhances resilience, perseverance, and adaptive performance under pressure (Lent et al., 2022; Bandura, 2018). Within the TEAMWORK framework, togetherness is therefore conceptualised as engineered interdependence: a

structured and intentional alignment of roles, responsibilities, and competencies. This alignment transforms diverse individuals into an integrated and capable unit, fostering coherent action, sustained engagement, and demonstrable achievement. By embedding togetherness as both a structural and cognitive dimension of teamwork, the framework positions collaboration as a disciplined, evidence-informed, and performance-oriented enterprise rather than a social ideal.

Everyone (E): Shared Accountability and Distributed Leadership

Within the TEAMWORK framework, the *Everyone* dimension reconceptualises inclusion as a purposeful, operational practice rather than a symbolic gesture. High-performing teams do not rely on mere presence or nominal membership; instead, each individual is embedded within clearly defined roles, responsibilities, and mutual expectations that delineate how their expertise, judgement, and effort contribute to collective goals (Lee et al., 2022). By clarifying contributions and formalising accountability, teams reduce role ambiguity, minimise duplicated effort, and strengthen the reliability of collaborative output. In this respect, inclusion is not simply an aspirational ideal but a disciplined mechanism for ensuring that participation is measurable, intentional, and aligned with organisational objectives (Wang et al., 2019).

At a deeper level, *Everyone* recognises the intrinsic value of each member's knowledge and practical capability within the collaborative architecture. Contributions are not only acknowledged but systematically integrated into planning, execution, and evaluation processes. This approach reflects contemporary scholarship in participative and shared leadership, which shows that distributed influence structures foster adaptive performance, innovation, and resilience in complex organisational environments (Hoch & Dulebohn, 2017; Zhu et al., 2018; Kang et al., 2024). Psychological safety is central to this dynamic, acting as a bridge between inclusion and team learning: when members feel secure expressing ideas, challenging assumptions, or raising concerns, engagement deepens and collective intelligence is strengthened (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023; Frazier et al., 2017; Newman et al., 2017). Accordingly, within the TEAMWORK framework, *Everyone* is theorised as structured, accountable inclusion—an architecture of shared leadership and coordinated responsibility in which distributed expertise converges in disciplined concert to generate durable, high-quality team performance.

Achieves (A): Disciplined Outcome Orientation

Within the TEAMWORK framework, *Achieves* represents a principled insistence that collaboration must culminate in demonstrable value. Contemporary organisational scholarship increasingly affirms that team effectiveness cannot be inferred from harmony or participation alone, but must be evaluated through clearly specified objectives, measurable outputs and accountable delivery systems (Aguinis & Burgi-Tian, 2021; Mathieu et al., 2019). In complex and resource-constrained environments, high-performing teams distinguish themselves not by the intensity of interaction but by the clarity of their goals and the discipline with which those goals are pursued. Strategic management research further underscores that sustained organisational advantage derives from coherent goal alignment, performance monitoring and

Odiase. The teamwork framework: an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven model

deliberate capability development rather than diffuse collective effort (Teece, 2018). Thus, achievement within this framework is neither incidental nor rhetorical; it is engineered through explicit performance indicators, structured evaluation cycles and shared responsibility for results. By requiring teams to define success in operational terms and to establish transparent measures of progress, the Achieves dimension redirects attention from symbolic collaboration to measurable organisational contribution.

Importantly, positioning achievement at the centre of teamwork does not negate the value of trust, cohesion or psychological safety. Rather, contemporary evidence suggests that these relational qualities function as enabling conditions that support disciplined execution and learning-oriented performance systems (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023; Salas et al., 2018). Teams that integrate strategic planning with continuous feedback and performance review mechanisms are more likely to convert relational capital into sustained productivity and innovation (Rico et al., 2018). In this respect, achievement assumes an ethical dimension: it reflects fidelity to commitments, stewardship of resources and accountability to stakeholders. When embedded within team culture, outcome orientation fosters professional integrity and service excellence, ensuring that collaboration serves organisational mission rather than merely social comfort. The Achieves element therefore transforms teamwork from a well-intentioned social arrangement into a results-driven enterprise, one that balances collegiality with rigour and aligns collective effort with long-term sustainability.

More (M): Synergistic Value Creation

The *More* dimension captures the essence of synergistic value creation: the condition under which collective accomplishment exceeds the sum of individual contributions. Contemporary team research increasingly demonstrates that diversity in expertise, cognitive approaches and professional background enhances performance only when it is effectively integrated through deliberate coordination and constructive exchange (Mathieu et al., 2019; Salas et al., 2018). In knowledge-intensive and innovation-driven environments, teams that actively synthesise varied perspectives are more likely to generate creative solutions and robust decisions than those that merely aggregate individual outputs (Lee et al., 2019). However, recent scholarship cautions that diversity alone does not guarantee superior outcomes; without disciplined integration mechanisms, cognitive variety may devolve into fragmentation or conflict (Rico et al., 2018). Synergy therefore emerges not from coexistence but from structured interaction—where members critically examine assumptions, refine one another’s thinking and align their specialised competencies toward shared objectives. In such contexts, collective intelligence becomes a cultivated capability rather than an accidental by-product of collaboration.

From a strategic standpoint, *More* represents the inflection point at which organised collaboration translates into measurable organisational advantage. Research on team learning and adaptive performance indicates that synergy is strengthened by role clarity, transparent communication and environments that reward contribution over competition (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023; Newman et al., 2017). Where teams engage in structured dialogue and reflective practices, they are better positioned to integrate insights, respond to uncertainty and sustain performance under pressure (Argote & Miron-Spektor, 2018). Moreover, empirical

studies link coordinated knowledge integration to enhanced innovation outcomes and organisational resilience, particularly in volatile and digitally mediated contexts (Bapuji et al., 2019; Teece, 2018). Within this framework, therefore, *More* is neither rhetorical aspiration nor motivational slogan; it is the demonstrable outcome of disciplined alignment, rational deliberation and knowledge-informed action. It signals the moment when collaboration matures into collective capability—when integrated effort generates value that no single actor, however competent, could achieve in isolation.

With (W)

The *With (W)* dimension situates teamwork within a consciously designed normative and procedural infrastructure that renders collaboration reliable rather than improvised. Contemporary scholarship increasingly affirms that high-performing teams are distinguished not merely by interpersonal goodwill but by the presence of clearly articulated governance mechanisms - explicit decision rights, defined communication pathways, structured conflict-resolution processes and mutually endorsed performance standards (Burton et al., 2020; Rico et al., 2018). In complex organisational environments characterised by hybrid work arrangements, cross-functional interdependence and digital coordination, ambiguity in roles or authority frequently produces duplication of effort, latent power struggles and reduced accountability (Mortensen & Haas, 2018). Recent research further demonstrates that teams operating under formally clarified interaction norms exhibit greater alignment, faster coordination cycles and improved implementation outcomes (Mathieu et al., 2019; O'Neill et al., 2022). Thus, within the TEAMWORK framework, *With* represents the codified architecture of collaboration - an agreed system of engagement that channels collective energy towards strategic priorities and shields performance from the erosive effects of informality and assumption.

More profoundly, the *With* element challenges the persistent misconception that structure inhibits creativity or relational warmth. Empirical evidence suggests the opposite: well-defined norms and procedural clarity cultivate psychological safety precisely because they reduce uncertainty about expectations and boundaries (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023). When individuals understand how decisions are made, how dissent is expressed and how accountability is enacted, trust becomes institutional rather than merely interpersonal. Studies on team resilience and adaptive performance indicate that shared operating frameworks enhance a team's capacity to withstand pressure, coordinate under stress and sustain effectiveness amid disruption (Bowers et al., 2018; Sharma & Sharma, 2023). In this sense, structure civilises collaboration; it transforms goodwill into dependable cooperation and ensures that participation is anchored in principle rather than personality. The *With* dimension therefore embeds teamwork within a governance logic - one in which shared norms, procedural consistency and disciplined coordination provide the stability necessary for innovation, learning and long-term performance sustainability.

Odiase. The teamwork framework: an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven model

Organised (O): Structural Coordination and Design Alignment

Within the TEAMWORK framework, *Organisation* represents the deliberate structuring of collective effort, emphasising that effective collaboration is not automatic but emerges from intentionally designed systems of coordination, workflow integration, and role clarity. Contemporary organisational design scholarship highlights that aligning structural configuration with strategy, task interdependence and decision rights is critical for sustaining reliable performance in complex environments (Burton, Obel, & Håkansson, 2020; Gulati, Puranam, & Tushman, 2019). Empirical studies indicate that ambiguity in roles or poorly defined communication channels often leads to process inefficiencies and performance erosion, particularly in cross-functional and multi-team settings (Rico, Alcover, & Taberner, 2018; Joseph, Klingebiel, & Wilson, 2020). In this sense, organisation within TEAMWORK is not synonymous with bureaucratic rigidity; rather, it is disciplined coherence, codifying responsibilities, formalising communication pathways, and embedding accountability mechanisms so that diverse expertise can be synchronised, rather than dispersed. It represents the underlying structural intelligence of teamwork - the subtle governance logic that sustains clarity, continuity, and collective focus.

Importantly, contemporary systems theory demonstrates that structural coordination does not constrain innovation but supports it by reducing uncertainty, managing complexity, and alleviating cognitive overload (Puranam, Alexy, & Reitzig, 2019; Nadler & Tushman, 2021). When leadership authority is clearly aligned with task sequencing and feedback loops are institutionalised, teams are better equipped to anticipate bottlenecks, prevent duplication, and maintain adaptive momentum under dynamic conditions (Burton et al., 2020). Research on process integration and team effectiveness further confirms that defined accountability frameworks and monitoring routines enhance performance stability, particularly in knowledge-intensive or high-stakes contexts (Rico et al., 2018; Joseph et al., 2020; Salas et al., 2018). Within the TEAMWORK framework, *Organisation* transforms collaboration from informal social exchange into dependable institutional practice, creating structural conditions in which creativity flourishes, strategic intent is operationalised, and performance standards are consistently met. As such, *Organised (O)* constitutes the backbone of effective teamwork, ensuring that collective intention translates seamlessly into coordinated execution and measurable organisational value.

Rational (R): Evidence-Based and Strategically Informed Decision-Making

Within the TEAMWORK framework, the *Rational* dimension represents disciplined, evidence-informed collective cognition that anchors team deliberation in strategic clarity and organisational purpose. Rationality is understood not as detachment from emotion but as intellectual rigour: a systematic commitment to interrogating assumptions, clarifying problems, evaluating alternatives, and anticipating consequences (Powell et al., 2018; Kahneman et al., 2021). Contemporary scholarship in behavioural strategy emphasises that organisational decision-making is constrained by bounded rationality, yet these limitations can be mitigated through structured analytic routines, scenario planning, and deliberate bias-reduction processes (Hodgkinson & Healey, 2021; Greer et al., 2018). In complex and volatile environments, teams

that integrate verifiable data, critical reflection, and explicit decision protocols are better positioned to avoid premature closure, hierarchical conformity, and error-prone judgement (Lehmann-Willenbrock et al., 2018). From a strategic management standpoint, rational decision-making underpins dynamic capability development, enabling teams to continuously align resource allocation, operational priorities, and capability renewal with evolving environmental demands (Teece, 2018; Helfat & Peteraf, 2015). Consequently, rationality within TEAMWORK transforms discussion from unstructured opinion-sharing into deliberate inquiry, ensuring that collaborative effort remains analytically sound, strategically coherent, and purpose-driven.

Beyond supporting decision quality, rationality strengthens the credibility and sustainability of team performance. Evidence-based management research demonstrates that decisions integrating scientific evidence, contextual intelligence, and practitioner expertise yield superior organisational outcomes and reduce risk exposure (Briner et al., 2019; Rousseau & Barends, 2018). Mechanisms such as risk assessment matrices, post-implementation reviews, and scenario simulations function as learning tools that embed reflective practice into execution. Team cognition studies further reveal that disciplined evaluation processes diminish vulnerability to groupthink, social conformity, and authority-driven bias, fostering a culture where ideas succeed on merit rather than hierarchy (Greer et al., 2018; Hodgkinson & Healey, 2021). In resource-constrained and high-stakes contexts, such reasoned coordination is critical for sustaining operational excellence, safeguarding organisational legitimacy, and enhancing collective adaptability. Accordingly, within the TEAMWORK framework, the *Rational* dimension serves as the intellectual backbone of collaboration: it safeguards teams from impulsive consensus, institutionalises learning within decision cycles, and ensures that collective action is ethically defensible, strategically aligned, and outcome-oriented.

Knowledge (K): Knowledge-Driven Collaboration

Within the TEAMWORK framework, the *Knowledge (K)* dimension is conceptualised as a dynamic organisational capability that actively shapes team behaviour and performance, rather than merely serving as a repository of information. Contemporary scholarship in organisational learning emphasises that sustained competitive advantage emerges not simply from possession of knowledge, but from the capacity to generate, share, synthesise and apply knowledge across different levels of the organisation (Argote & Miron-Spektor, 2018; Grant, 2019; Nonaka et al., 2020). In practice, this entails embedding knowledge processes into daily work routines through collaborative platforms, structured reflection sessions, cross-functional dialogue, mentoring, and peer consultation, which collectively enable teams to transform raw data into actionable insights (Foss & Saebi, 2018; Leonardi, 2021). Moreover, the creation and integration of knowledge are enhanced when information flows are transparent, communication norms foster psychological safety, and team members are encouraged to challenge assumptions constructively, thereby supporting informed, evidence-based decision-making (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023; Politis, 2022). In this sense, knowledge operates as the cognitive backbone of effective teamwork, enabling members to reason critically, anticipate complexities, and respond with strategic precision rather than relying on intuition or conjecture.

Odiase. The teamwork framework: an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven model

Sustained innovation, adaptability, and long-term performance are direct consequences of deliberately cultivating knowledge as a team capability. Research in knowledge management and dynamic capability theory demonstrates that organisations which institutionalise learning routines - such as after-action reviews, documentation of lessons learned, and iterative experimentation - develop resilience and maintain strategic agility in volatile environments (Teece, 2018; Bingham & Eisenhardt, 2019; Felin & Powell, 2021). Learning-oriented teams are particularly effective at integrating diverse expertise, reconciling conflicting perspectives, and continuously recalibrating strategies to align with environmental shifts (Argote, 2022; Nonaka et al., 2020). Through repeated cycles of acquisition, reflection, and application, knowledge compounds into organisational memory, creating both a repository of insight and a forward-looking strategic advantage. Consequently, in high-functioning teams, knowledge is neither incidental nor episodic; it is the enduring engine that drives relevance, fosters innovation, and sustains performance excellence in an era defined by rapid technological, institutional, and social change.

Theoretical Propositions of the TEAMWORK Framework

Proposition 1: Togetherness and Shared Accountability

P1: Structured collaborative synergy (**Together**) positively influences **shared accountability and distributed participation (Everyone)** in teams. This proposition follows from social interdependence theory, which suggests that when collective goals and task interdependence are clearly structured, individuals perceive their success as linked to the success of others. As a result, team members become more willing to assume responsibility and actively contribute to collaborative tasks.

Proposition 2: Shared Accountability and Outcome Orientation

P2: Shared accountability and distributed leadership (**Everyone**) positively influence **disciplined outcome orientation (Achieves)** in teams. When roles and responsibilities are clearly distributed, teams experience stronger accountability structures that promote commitment to measurable objectives and performance standards.

Proposition 3: Outcome Orientation and Synergistic Value Creation

P3: Disciplined outcome orientation (**Achieves**) positively influences **synergistic value creation (More)** within teams. Teams that operate with clearly defined goals, evaluation mechanisms, and performance monitoring processes are more likely to transform collaborative interaction into outcomes that exceed individual contributions.

Proposition 4: Procedural Governance as a Moderating Mechanism

P4: Normative and procedural infrastructure (**With**) positively moderates the relationship between **Achieves** and **More**, such that teams operating under clearly defined norms and governance structures are more likely to convert outcome orientation into synergistic performance. Structured interaction norms reduce ambiguity and coordination breakdowns, thereby strengthening the relationship between disciplined execution and collective value creation.

Proposition 5: Structural Coordination and Collaborative Synergy

P5: Structural coordination and design alignment (**Organised**) positively influence **structured collaborative synergy (Together)** within teams. Organisational design literature demonstrates that clearly defined roles, workflows and communication pathways strengthen interdependence among team members and enhance coordinated collaboration.

Proposition 6: Rational Decision-Making as a Mediating Mechanism

P6: Evidence-based decision-making (**Rational**) mediates the relationship between **Organised structural coordination** and **Achieves outcome orientation**. When structural clarity exists, teams are better able to engage in systematic analysis, evaluate alternatives and make informed decisions that support goal attainment.

Proposition 7: Knowledge Integration and Decision Quality

P7: Knowledge-driven collaboration (**Knowledge**) positively influences **rational and evidence-based decision-making (Rational)** within teams. Knowledge management research shows that teams capable of integrating diverse expertise and experiential learning generate higher-quality decisions and more adaptive strategies.

Proposition 8: Knowledge as an Enabler of Synergistic Performance

P8: Knowledge-driven collaboration (**Knowledge**) positively influences **synergistic value creation (More)** through improved collective learning and expertise integration. Teams that actively generate, share and apply knowledge are better positioned to synthesise diverse insights, produce innovative solutions and sustain collective advantage.

Structural Logic of the TEAMWORK Model

The propositions suggest the following **conceptual structure of the framework**:

Antecedent Conditions

1. Organised (structural coordination)
2. Together (collaborative interdependence)

Team Process Mechanisms

1. Everyone (shared accountability)
2. With (normative governance)

Cognitive and Strategic Mechanisms

1. Knowledge (knowledge integration)
2. Rational (evidence-based decision-making)

Odiase. The teamwork framework: an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven model

Performance Outcomes

1. Achieves (disciplined results)
2. More (synergistic value creation)

The Odiase Teamwork Framework Flowchart Diagram

Author’s Construct, 2026

Structural Relationships within the TEAMWORK Framework



Figure 1. The TEAMWORK Framework



Author’s Construct, 2026

The **Odiase TEAMWORK Framework** reconceptualises collaboration as an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven process. Central elements: *Together, Everyone, Achieves, More, With, Organised, Rational, and Knowledge* - interact dynamically, ensuring cohesion, structured coordination, logical decision-making, and continuous learning. This model

transforms teamwork from a relational concept into an operational, performance-oriented system for contemporary organisations.

Although each dimension of the TEAMWORK framework is conceptually distinct and anchored in its own theoretical rationale, their explanatory power emerges from systematic interdependence rather than isolation. The elements *Together* and *Everyone* establish the relational scaffolding of collaboration, promoting cohesion and inclusive participation, yet without *Organised* processes, even the most committed team can succumb to inefficiency or fragmented effort. *Rational* decision-making sharpens the pursuit of *Achieves* by ensuring that collective goals are pursued with logical clarity, while *Knowledge* provides the substantive foundation that informs decisions, supports learning, and sustains performance. Similarly, the synergistic multiplier captured in *More* is contingent upon both structured coordination and the continuous mobilisation of collective expertise. In this sense, the framework transcends a mere mnemonic or a list of desirable traits, presenting instead a deliberately configured system in which relational, cognitive, and epistemic dimensions mutually reinforce one another.

Furthermore, may I reiterate that the strength of the TEAMWORK framework lies in the patterned interactions among its components. *Organised* processes moderate the influence of *Together*, channeling collaborative energy into productive outcomes rather than unstructured effort. *Rationality* amplifies *Achieves* by aligning goals, strategies, and actions through evaluative reasoning, ensuring that performance is both purposeful and measurable. Meanwhile, *Knowledge* underpins the enduring effectiveness of *More*, enabling teams to translate shared experience into adaptive practices, innovate collectively, and maintain competitive advantage. These interdependencies render the framework a dynamic and explanatory model, capable of illuminating the mechanisms that drive both immediate results and sustained organisational performance.

By foregrounding the structural, cognitive, and knowledge-based interconnections within teams, the TEAMWORK framework offers a coherent lens for understanding collaboration in contemporary organisational contexts. Rather than treating teamwork as a purely social or affective phenomenon, it emphasises how formal coordination, evidence-informed reasoning, and systematic learning combine to produce measurable outcomes and long-term value. Its operational clarity makes it applicable across diverse organisational environments - from corporate teams and educational institutions to public service agencies - while its theoretically grounded interdependencies provide a robust platform for research, assessment, and practical intervention. In this way, the TEAMWORK framework moves beyond abstract theorisation to offer a practical, actionable, and academically defensible model of organised, rational, and knowledge-driven collaboration.

Find below a tabular explanation of a comparative theoretical positioning of Odiase Teamwork Framework as against other models.

Odiase. The teamwork framework: an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven model

Comparative Positioning of the TEAMWORK Framework in Team and Organisational Theory

S/N	Model	Primary Focus	Core Strength	Identified Limitation	How the Odiase TEAMWORK Framework Extends	Nature of Contribution
1	Input–Process–Outcome (IPO) Model (Ilgen et al., 2005; Mathieu et al., 2019)	Linear relationship between team inputs, processes, and outcomes	Provides structured analytical clarity and strong empirical grounding	Often criticised for static assumptions and insufficient treatment of knowledge dynamics	Reintegrates structure (Organised) and cognition (Rational, Knowledge-driven) while embedding continuous learning rather than linear process assumptions	Integrative
2	Big Five of Teamwork (Salas et al., 2005)	Behavioural teamwork competencies (leadership, mutual monitoring, backup behaviour, adaptability, team orientation)	Strong behavioural operationalisation and wide application in training contexts	Behaviourally rich but under-theorises epistemic and structural architecture of teamwork	Extends behavioural competencies by incorporating knowledge integration and rational decision architecture as foundational infrastructure	Integrative
3	Psychological Safety Framework (Edmondson & Lei, 2014; Edmondson & Bransby, 2023)	Interpersonal climate enabling voice and learning	Robust explanation of learning behaviour and error reporting	Focuses primarily on relational climate with limited structural or strategic emphasis	Retains learning climate logic while integrating formal organisation, rational coordination and institutionalised knowledge	Multilevel

S/ N	Model	Primary Focus	Core Strength	Identified Limitation	How the Odiase TEAMWORK Framework Extends	Nature of Contribution
					systems	
4	Knowledge-Based View (KBV) (Grant, 2019; Foss & Saebi, 2018; Stoian et al., 2024)	Knowledge as primary source of competitive advantage	Strong strategic and epistemic grounding	Predominantly firm-level orientation; less explicit about micro-team coordination mechanisms	Operationalises knowledge processes at the team level and embeds them within structured collaboration routines	Translational
5	Dynamic Capabilities Framework (Tece, 2018; Helfat & Peteraf, 2015 updates)	Sensing, seizing and transforming in volatile environments	Strong explanation of strategic adaptation	Macro-strategic orientation with limited attention to everyday team-level rational coordination	Translates dynamic capability logic into actionable team routines: organised processes, rational judgement and knowledge-driven learning cycles	Translational
6	Shared Mental Models Theory (Mathieu et al., 2019)	Cognitive alignment among team members	Explains coordination and anticipatory performance	Emphasises cognition but less explicit on structural design and institutional learning	Integrates shared cognition with formal organisation and deliberate knowledge institutionalisation	Integrative

Author's Compilation (2026)

Analytical Synthesis

A clear pattern emerging from the comparison is that existing teamwork and organisational models tend to privilege one analytical dimension at the expense of others. Behavioural frameworks emphasise interpersonal interaction, cognitive models focus on shared

Odiase. The teamwork framework: an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven model

understanding, and strategic theories prioritise macro-level capabilities or knowledge advantages. However, these approaches often treat **structure, cognition, knowledge integration, and decision rationality** as separate analytical domains rather than as **mutually reinforcing elements of collaborative performance**.

The TEAMWORK framework occupies a distinctive theoretical space by **integrating structural coordination, distributed accountability, rational decision-making and knowledge-driven learning within a single conceptual architecture**. Rather than privileging either relational climate, behavioural competencies, or macro-strategic capability, the framework conceptualises teamwork as a **multilevel organisational system in which collaboration is simultaneously structural, cognitive, and epistemic**.

By embedding collaboration within **formal coordination mechanisms (Organised), evidence-based deliberation (Rational), and institutionalised learning processes (Knowledge)**, the framework addresses several limitations observed in existing models - namely their tendency toward behavioural reductionism, macro-level abstraction, or static process assumptions. Consequently, the TEAMWORK framework contributes a **structurally integrated perspective of collaboration**, positioning teamwork not merely as interpersonal cooperation but as an organised, knowledge-driven and strategically aligned organisational capability.

While existing frameworks have significantly advanced the understanding of team effectiveness, they tend to privilege either behavioural processes, relational climate, strategic adaptation, or knowledge advantage in isolation. The Odiase TEAMWORK framework advances the literature by integrating structural organisation (O), rational decision coordination (R), and institutionalised knowledge processes (K) within a unified architecture of collaborative performance. Rather than treating teamwork as primarily behavioural or affective, the framework reconceptualises it as an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven system of collective action.

Practical Implications

The practical value of the TEAMWORK framework lies in its capacity to translate abstract principles of collaboration into concrete organisational practices. While teamwork is frequently celebrated in managerial rhetoric, empirical research suggests that collective effectiveness depends less on aspirational language and more on deliberate structural and cognitive design (Salas, Reyes, & McDaniel, 2018). By foregrounding organisation, rationality and knowledge, the framework offers leaders and practitioners a structured diagnostic lens through which teamwork challenges can be systematically identified and addressed.

For example, consider a hospital emergency response unit responsible for coordinating patient intake, diagnosis, and treatment during peak periods. In many healthcare settings, breakdowns occur not because professionals lack competence but because coordination mechanisms are unclear. Applying the TEAMWORK framework, hospital administrators may first strengthen the **Organised** dimension by clarifying task sequencing between triage nurses, physicians, and laboratory technicians. The **Together** and **Everyone** components are operationalised by ensuring that each professional understands both their individual responsibilities and how their

decisions affect downstream clinical processes. To improve decision quality, the **Rational** element is introduced through structured case briefings and evidence-based treatment protocols, while the **Knowledge** dimension is reinforced through post-shift reviews where teams discuss lessons learned from critical cases. As a result, patient flow becomes more efficient, communication errors decline, and treatment outcomes improve - demonstrating how structured collaboration can directly enhance service delivery in high-stakes environments.

A second illustration can be drawn from a **technology start-up developing a new digital product**. In early stages, many start-ups struggle with fragmented collaboration between software engineers, marketing specialists, and product designers. Using the TEAMWORK framework as a diagnostic tool, leadership can redesign collaboration processes so that the **With** dimension establishes clear decision protocols and communication norms for cross-functional meetings. The **Achieves** component ensures that the team defines measurable development milestones and performance indicators, preventing discussions from drifting into unfocused brainstorming. Through the **More** dimension, the diverse expertise of engineers, designers and marketers is deliberately integrated during iterative product reviews, enabling the team to generate solutions that surpass the capacity of any single discipline. Simultaneously, the **Knowledge** component institutionalises learning through documentation of coding solutions, customer feedback analysis and continuous improvement cycles. In this way, the framework transforms an initially fragmented group into a coordinated innovation system capable of delivering scalable product outcomes.

These examples illustrate how the TEAMWORK framework moves beyond conceptual advocacy for collaboration and instead **operationalises teamwork as a structured organisational capability**. By aligning roles, institutionalising knowledge flows and embedding evidence-based decision processes, the framework enables organisations to convert collaborative intent into disciplined, measurable and sustainable performance outcomes.

.Organisational Leadership

For organisational leaders, the TEAMWORK framework provides a strategic architecture for cultivating high-performing teams grounded in accountability and disciplined coordination. Contemporary evidence-based management scholarship underscores the importance of integrating structured processes with informed judgement rather than relying solely on intuition or charisma (Rousseau, 2018). The *Organised* dimension reinforces role clarity and workflow alignment, which research consistently links to improved coordination and reduced performance ambiguity (Mathieu et al., 2019). The *Rational* component encourages leaders to embed evidence-informed decision routines, particularly in complex and uncertain environments where cognitive biases can undermine collective judgement (Teece, 2018). Meanwhile, the *Knowledge* dimension supports institutionalised learning mechanisms, aligning with findings that psychologically safe and knowledge-sharing teams demonstrate superior adaptability (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023). Through this integrated approach, leadership becomes less performative and more structurally intentional, reinforcing measurable collective outcomes rather than symbolic unity.

Odiase. The teamwork framework: an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven model

Educational Management

In educational settings, where multiple professional groups must coordinate around shared institutional objectives, structured collaboration is indispensable. Research in educational leadership increasingly emphasises data-informed decision-making and distributed governance as critical determinants of school and university effectiveness (Hallinger, 2020; Harris & Jones, 2020). The TEAMWORK framework's *Organised* dimension supports the establishment of coherent governance structures and workflow clarity, mitigating fragmentation in institutional processes. The *Rational* dimension aligns with evidence advocating systematic evaluation and data utilisation in curriculum planning and resource allocation (Brown, Schildkamp, & Hubers, 2021). Furthermore, the *Knowledge* component reinforces professional learning communities and reflective practice, both of which are associated with sustained institutional improvement (Harris & Jones, 2020). Within this context, teamwork is reframed not as collegial sentiment, but as a structured mechanism for educational effectiveness and long-term institutional resilience.

Public Service Delivery

Public sector organisations frequently operate within complex bureaucratic systems requiring cross-departmental coordination and procedural accountability. Contemporary public administration research highlights the necessity of integrated governance mechanisms and evidence-based policy implementation to enhance service delivery outcomes (Bryson, Crosby, & Bloomberg, 2018; Head, 2022). The TEAMWORK framework strengthens public service contexts by embedding formal coordination (*Organised*), systematic evaluation (*Rational*), and institutional memory (*Knowledge*) within collaborative processes. Such integration mitigates responsibility diffusion and supports transparent performance monitoring. In environments characterised by resource constraints and political scrutiny, knowledge-driven coordination enhances policy coherence and adaptive responsiveness, aligning teamwork with citizen-centred accountability.

Team-Based Enterprises and SMEs

In small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), teamwork often evolves organically through informal relationships. While informality may promote flexibility, research indicates that sustainable growth requires progressively formalised routines and knowledge retention systems (Durst & Zieba, 2019; Felin & Powell, 2021). The TEAMWORK framework assists SMEs in balancing agility with structural clarity. The *Organised* and *With* dimensions encourage explicit task allocation and coordination norms, while *Rational* strengthens strategic planning under uncertainty. Importantly, the *Knowledge* dimension facilitates systematic expertise capture, reducing vulnerability to employee turnover and enhancing scalability. By institutionalising learning processes, SMEs can transform collaborative effort into durable competitive advantage, consistent with knowledge-based and dynamic capability perspectives (Grant, 2019; Teece, 2018).

Collectively, these applications demonstrate that the TEAMWORK framework is not merely conceptual; it is operationalisable across diverse organisational domains, providing a coherent architecture through which collaboration may be structured, evaluated and refined.

Research Implications and Directions

The TEAMWORK framework offers a substantive platform for future empirical and theoretical inquiry. A primary research priority involves the development and validation of measurement instruments capable of capturing its eight interrelated dimensions. Rigorous scale development procedures, including construct validation and multi-level modelling, would strengthen its empirical grounding and facilitate comparative analysis across sectors (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2020). Quantitative investigations may examine the relationship between TEAMWORK dimensions and indicators such as team performance, adaptive capacity, and organisational effectiveness.

Comparative scholarship represents a second promising direction. Although existing teamwork models emphasise cohesion, behavioural coordination or psychological climate, fewer integrate structural organisation, rational decision architecture and institutionalised knowledge processes within a unified model (Mathieu et al., 2019; Salas et al., 2018). Empirical comparison with established frameworks would clarify the incremental explanatory power of explicitly incorporating rationality and knowledge as foundational dimensions.

Context-specific research also warrants sustained attention. Contemporary management scholarship increasingly acknowledges that much of mainstream organisational theory remains Western-centric and insufficiently attentive to institutional diversity (Zoogah & Nkomo, 2020). The TEAMWORK framework holds particular relevance for African contexts, public institutions and SMEs, where structural constraints and knowledge flows may operate differently from corporate settings typically examined in the literature. Mixed-method and longitudinal designs could illuminate how organised, rational and knowledge-driven collaboration evolves across cultural and economic environments.

As an originating conceptualisation, the TEAMWORK framework (Odiase, 2026) establishes a theoretical foundation upon which subsequent empirical studies may build. Future research that rigorously tests, refines and contextualises its dimensions will not only validate the framework but also advance broader debates concerning the structural and epistemic foundations of effective teamwork in contemporary organisations.

CONCLUSION

This paper has presented the TEAMWORK framework (Odiase, 2026) as a novel conceptual model that reconceptualises teamwork as an organised, rational and knowledge-driven process. By integrating insights from established organisational theories into a coherent structure, the framework makes a substantive theoretical contribution to the literature on teamwork and collaboration.

Odiase. The teamwork framework: an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven model ...

The novelty of the framework lies in its deliberate shift away from purely relational interpretations of teamwork towards a structured, cognitively grounded and knowledge-centred model. Its relevance to contemporary organisational challenges, including leadership effectiveness, educational management, public service delivery and enterprise performance, underscores its broad applicability. In an increasingly complex and interdependent organisational landscape, the TEAMWORK framework offers scholars and practitioners a rigorous lens for understanding and improving collective performance. As teamwork continues to shape organisational success, this framework provides a timely, defensible and enduring contribution to organisational theory and practice. Beyond practice, the TEAMWORK framework invites sustained scholarly engagement. Its structured dimensions offer fertile ground for empirical investigation and theoretical refinement. Future research may focus on the development and validation of measurement instruments for each of the eight dimensions, enabling quantitative assessment of organised, rational and knowledge-driven teamwork.

Comparative studies represent another promising direction. Researchers may examine the explanatory power of the TEAMWORK framework relative to existing teamwork models, particularly those that emphasise cohesion or relational dynamics. Such comparisons can illuminate the added value of incorporating organisation, rationality and knowledge as core components of teamwork. Context-specific applications also warrant attention. The framework is especially suited to research in African contexts, public sector organisations and SMEs, where existing teamwork models often fail to capture structural and institutional realities. Qualitative and mixed-method studies can explore how the framework operates under varying cultural, economic and organisational conditions. The TEAMWORK framework (Odiase, 2026) represents an initial conceptualisation of structured, knowledge-driven teamwork. While intended as a foundational reference, it is offered as a starting point for future research to test, refine, or extend, allowing the broader scholarly community to build upon and critically engage with its propositions and structure.

REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H., & Burgi-Tian, J. (2021). Measuring performance during crises and beyond: The performance promoter score. *Business Horizons*, 64(1), 149–160.
- Argote, L., & Miron-Spektor, E. (2018). Organizational learning: From experience to knowledge. *Organization Science*, 29(3), 553–568.
- Argote, L. (2022). *Organizational learning: Creating, retaining and transferring knowledge* (3rd ed.). Springer.
- Bapuji, H., Hora, M., & Saeed, A. M. (2019). Intentions, intermediaries, and interaction: Examining the emergence of routines. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(2), 320–342.
- Bingham, C. B., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2019). Rational heuristics: The ‘simple rules’ that strategists learn from process experience. *Strategic Management Journal*, 40(9), 1434–1466.

- Bowers, C. A., Kreutzer, C., Cannon-Bowers, J. A., & Lamb, J. (2018). Team resilience as a second-order emergent state: A theoretical model and research directions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 1360.
- Briner, R. B., Denyer, D., & Rousseau, D. M. (2019). Evidence-based management: Concept cleanup time? *Academy of Management Perspectives, 33*(3), 374–389.
- Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Salas, E., Pierce, L., & Kendall, D. (2016). Understanding team adaptation: A conceptual analysis and model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(6), 1189–1207.
- Burton, R. M., Obel, B., & Håkonsson, D. D. (2020). *Organizational design: A step-by-step approach* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1*(1), 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305>
- Edmondson, A. C., & Bransby, D. P. (2023). Psychological safety comes of age. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10*, 55–84.
- Felin, T., Foss, N. J., Heimeriks, K. H., & Madsen, T. L. (2015). Microfoundations of routines and capabilities: Individuals, processes, and structure. *Journal of Management Studies, 52*(4), 575–606.
- Foss, N. J., & Saebi, T. (2018). Fifteen years of research on business model innovation. *Journal of Management, 43*(1), 200–227.
- Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., & Vracheva, V. (2017). Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension. *Personnel Psychology, 70*(1), 113–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12183>
- Grant, R. M. (2019). The knowledge-based view of the firm: Progress and prospects. *Journal of Management, 45*(3), 1097–1121.
- Greer, L. L., de Jong, B. A., Schouten, M. E., & Dannals, J. E. (2018). Why and when hierarchy impacts team effectiveness: A meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*(6), 591–613.
- Gulati, R., Puranam, P., & Tushman, M. (2019). Meta-organization design: Rethinking design in interdependent systems. *Strategic Management Journal, 40*(12), 2033–2058.
- Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. (2015). Managerial cognitive capabilities and the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal, 36*(6), 831–850.

Odiase. The teamwork framework: an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven model

- Hoch, J. E., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2017). Team personality composition, emergent leadership, and shared leadership in virtual teams: A theoretical framework. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(4), 678–693. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.12.002>
- Hodgkinson, G. P., & Healey, M. P. (2021). Psychological foundations of dynamic capabilities: Reflexion and reflection in strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(8), 1341–1365.
- Humphrey, S. E., & Aime, F. (2014). Team microdynamics: Toward an organising approach to teamwork. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 443–503.
- Ilgen, D. R., Hollenbeck, J. R., Johnson, M., & Jundt, D. (2005). Teams in organizations: From input–process–output models to IMO models. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 517–543. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070250>
- Jiang, K., & Messersmith, J. G. (2018). On the shoulders of giants: A meta-review of strategic human resource management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(1), 6–33.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2019). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09339057>
- Joseph, J., Klingebiel, R., & Wilson, A. J. (2020). Organizational structure and performance feedback. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41(5), 941–968.
- Kahneman, D., Sibony, O., & Sunstein, C. R. (2021). *Noise: A flaw in human judgment*. William Collins.
- Kang, S., Rhee, H., & Yoon, H. (2024). Shared leadership in global virtual teams: Effects on team effectiveness and innovation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 55(2), 231–248. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-023-00587-1>
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Ilgen, D. R. (2021). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 7(3), 77–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2006.00030.x>
- Lee, A., Lee, J., & Bae, J. (2022). Participative leadership and team performance: The mediating role of collective efficacy. *Leadership Quarterly*, 33(4), 101552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2022.101552>
- Lee, M. Y., Edmondson, A. C., Thomke, S., & Worline, M. (2019). The mixed effects of inconsistency on team performance. *Organization Science*, 30(3), 582–602.
- Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., Allen, J. A., & Kauffeld, S. (2018). A sequential analysis of procedural meeting communication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(3), 247–262.
- Leonardi, P. M. (2021). COVID-19 and the new technologies of organising: Digital exhaust, digital footprints and artificial intelligence in organisations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(1), 249–253.

- Mathieu, J. E., Gallagher, P. T., Domingo, M. A., & Klock, E. A. (2019). Embracing complexity: Reviewing the past decade of team effectiveness research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6, 17–46.
- Mortensen, M., & Haas, M. R. (2018). Rethinking teams: From bounded membership to dynamic participation. *Organization Science*, 29(2), 341–355.
- Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2021). Organizational architecture and adaptability: Aligning structure with strategy. *Journal of Organization Design*, 10(1), 1–17.
- Newman, A., Donohue, R., & Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(3), 521–535. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.01.001>
- Nonaka, I., Toyama, R., & Hirata, T. (2020). *Managing flow: A process theory of the knowledge-based firm* (2nd ed.). Springer..
- Odiase, B. O. (2026). *The TEAMWORK framework: A conceptual model for organised, rational, and knowledge-driven collaboration in organisations*. Unpublished conceptual manuscript.
- O’Neill, T. A., McLarnon, M. J. W., Hoffart, G., Woodley, H. J., & Allen, N. J. (2022). The structure of teamwork processes: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(10), 1772–1795.
- Powell, T. C., Lovallo, D., & Fox, C. R. (2018). Behavioral strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(5), 113–121.
- Puranam, P., Alexy, O., & Reitzig, M. (2019). What’s “new” about new forms of organizing? *Academy of Management Review*, 44(4), 920–936.
- Rico, R., Alcover, C. M., & Taberner, C. (2018). Work team effectiveness: A review of research from 2010 to 2015. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 469–498.
- Rousseau, D. M., & Barends, E. G. R. (2018). Evidence-based management: How to use evidence to make better decisions. *Kogan Page*.
- Salas, E., Sims, D. E., & Burke, C. S. (2005). Is there a “Big Five” in teamwork? *Small Group Research*, 36(5), 555–599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496405277134>
- Salas, E., Reyes, D. L., & McDaniel, S. H. (2018). The science of teamwork: Progress, reflections, and the road ahead. *American Psychologist*, 73(4), 593–600. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000334>
- Salas, E., Shuffler, M. L., Thayer, A. L., Bedwell, W. L., & Lazzara, E. H. (2015). Understanding and improving teamwork in organizations: A scientifically based practical guide. *Human Resource Management*, 54(4), 599–622. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21628>

Odiase. The teamwork framework: an organised, rational, and knowledge-driven model

- Sharma, P. N., & Sharma, S. (2023). Team adaptive performance: A review and integrative framework. *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(2), 100902.
- Stoian, M.-C., Tardios, J. A., & Samdanis, M. (2024). The knowledge-based view in international business: A systematic review of the literature and future research directions. *International Business Review*, 33(2), 102239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2023.102239>
- Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning*, 51(1), 40–49.
- Wang, G., Oh, I.-S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2019). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management*, 44(2), 3–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601119839700>
- Zhu, W., Sosik, J. J., Riggio, R. E., & Yang, B. (2018). Relationships between transformational and active transactional leadership and followers' organizational identification. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(2), 215–231. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-12-2016-0323>
- Zoogah, D. B., Peng, M. W., & Woldu, H. (2015). Institutions, resources, and organizational effectiveness in Africa. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 29(1), 7–31. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0033>