

Acceleration of renewal of technologies make management more complex and induces organizations to absorb more and more knowledge, in less and less time; of course each member of the organization accomplishes this task of its own but only a collective effort is doomed to be efficient. To cope with such a situation, it seems that we need a new breed of managers or leaders.

In fact, any collective work implies collaboration that is a team mind and software tools. It is not sufficient to acquire knowledge: you have to understand it, examine what it could be done with it, appreciate the pro's and con's of its possible applications before building projects based on it. The role of the whole organization which deserves the name of "learning organization" is to leverage the acquired knowledge to increase outcomes and performance.

This new kind of mind is no longer compliant with former styles of management and, even with people acquainted with teamwork, it is not safe from failure as it was stated by Chauhan and Bontis(1).

The principle is that if you allow information to reach individuals, the result will not be the same if you let each one turn it to results than if you incite them to discuss between them without constraint, sharing and selecting ideas.

So you have to find an intermediary structure which would be compelling enough to enforce a minimum of discipline avoiding excessive looseness whereas being nimble enough to allow the expression of everybody and the free matching of ideas and opinions.

In fact, we have not only to care about people and the way of managing them but we must wonder which kind of knowledge we need and for which goal: thus, we have to come back to the strategy of the firm and be able to translate into clear goals. That's why even if you are a supporter of a flat hierarchy and self-organizing units, you must have a leader who tells which way to go so that everybody might be able to know what he has to do. Once you know that, you may choose the knowledge you need either for current tasks or innovative ones

Teamwork is a way to tackle complexity and stimulate new ideas; but it may be used either to solve specific problems at a given time or to durably improve performance by launching new processes or products; so, you may have various teams, temporary or permanent ones.

According to the purpose of the team, you have various possibilities of choice as for membership and it is a very important criterion; in every case, a "trusted competency" is a must, as underline it Ken Thompson and Robin Good (2) . The term of "Bioteaming" must not let us

believe that we may
behave like ants but it reminds us that we are social beings and
therefore have a potential for
cooperating and collectively creating; ants too but they follow very
simple and unchangeable
rules sufficiently efficient for what they are doomed to and that may
lead to very unexpected
emergent situations. We shall observe that ants accomplish tasks in a
durable way and that for
such a type of tasks, they are highly specialized whereas for
innovating tasks the diversity lies in
the minds as Moster shows it (3). Of course we are neither ants nor
hermites and that is why the
choice of membership is so important in teams and depends on the very
nature of their purpose.

In any case, motivation and passion are genuine drivers and the
successful leader will take into
account these emotional factors.

- (1) Chauhan, N. and Bontis, N. (2004) "Organizational learning via
groupware: a path to
discovery or disaster?", Int. J. Technology Management, Vol. 27, Nos
6/7, pp.591-610
- (2) Thompson K., Good R., Bioteaming Manifesto, 2005.11.19
- (3) Moster N. M., Diversity of the Mind as the Key to Creativity at
Unilever, Unilever R&D
Vlaardingen, The Netherlands Journal compilation, Vol. 16, N° 1,
Blackwell Publishing,2007