The Comprehensive Assessment and Enhancement of Team Effectiveness

–Sarita Kumari*

ABSTRACT

"When a gifted team dedicates itself to unselfish trust and combines instinct with boldness and effort, it is ready to climb"-Patanjali, The Mahabhasya, 2nd c.
BCE Much of the organization's work is accomplished directly or indirectly through various teams. Team has a higher commitment to common goals of the organization. It has a clear purpose, clear roles and work assignments. Team facilitates open and free communication among the members leading to effective result. The purpose of this research is to study and analyze how to assess and enhance the effectiveness of a team so that it motivates the team members, helps in improved morale, accountability and commitment, and effective time management which in turn take the organization to a new height. The research design adopted for this study is exploratory in nature. Hypotheses are formulated and proved. The primary data are collected through the distribution of structured questionnaires to the employees. Assessment and enhancement of team effectiveness is very essential for the organizations. This in turn helps in driving the business for excellence.

Keywords: *Goal, Leadership, Openness, Team Effectiveness, Excellence and Trust*

INTRODUCTION

"When a gifted team dedicates itself to unselfish trust and combines instinct with boldness and effort, it is ready to climb"-Patanjali

Due to liberalization, privatization and globalization, organizations are becoming more competitive.They are facing multiple challenges and threats today such as threats to effectiveness, efficiency, and profitability;

*   Professor, SIES College of Management Studies, Sri Chandrasekarendra Saraswathi Vidyapuram, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.
     Email: dr.saritakumari@yahoo.com

challenges from turbulent environments and changing customer demands; and the constant challenge to maintain congruence among various organizational dimensions such as people, technology, strategy, culture, and processes. Jobs are becoming more demanding and require multiple skills, higher educational qualification and more participation and commitment from the employee's side and above all effective team management.

The workplace has changed over the last several decades as organizations have shifted to team-based work systems, where two or more employees interact interdependently toward a common and valued goal or objective, and who have each been assigned specific roles or functions to perform (Ilgen, Major, Hollenbeck, and Sego, 1993). Researchers have opined that team and teaming have become the hot topic. More than 80% of Fortune 500 companies utilizing work teams extensively within their organizations (Robbins, 2003). Studies found that organizations feel teams are more effective than individuals because team members can share the workload, monitor the behavior of their teammates, and combine their different areas of expertise (Mathieu et al., 2000). The techniques and the theory for understanding and improving team processes come from the laboratory training movement and research in group dynamics.

Although organizations have a number of different types of teams at their disposal, organizations realize that their teams must remain flexible and adaptive, ready to expand or contract at a moment's notice while continually innovating if they hope to be successful (Cooper, Dewe, and O'Driscoll, 2001). Sundstrom, 1999 has postulated that organizations are increasingly relying on action or performing teams, which conduct complex, time-limited engagements with audiences, adversaries, or challenging environments in performance eventsfor which teams maintain specialized collective skills. As per his views prototypical action teams include surgery teams, investigative units, government regulatory teams, military units, and expedition teams (Sundstrom, 1999).

Keeping the above things in front, the purpose of this research is to study and analyze how to assess and enhance the effectiveness of a team so that it motivates the team members, helps in improved morale, accountability and commitment, and effective time management which in turn take the organization to a new height.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Team is a group of people, who work together to achieve some common goal(s). Team is two or more people who must coordinate their activities to accomplish a common goal. The goals are basically organizational goals being congruent with individual goals (Shonk, 1992). A team is built by fostering trust, communication and cooperation to increase efficiency and improve performance which in turn brings cohesion (Verma, Rangnekar and Barua, 2011).

The importance of teams was first realized by the results of the Hawthorn studies conducted by Elton Mayo in 1930s. Other management thinker those gave attention to the importance of team functioning are Rensis Likert and Douglas McGregor. In 1961 Rensis Likert focused attention on teams as important elements of humanization of organizations. He opined that organizations are best conceptualized by systems of interlocking groups connected by linking pins, in which individuals occupy membership in two groups by being boss in one group and a subordinate in another group. The team has various characteristics like: The members of the team are interdependent, the team has common goal(s), team output and defects are closely monitored, each member has a distinct role and whose contribution is as important as any of them. There is focus on the motivational and behavioural factors such as security and advancement, and there is congruence between individual goals and that of the team goal.

Team Effectiveness

To deal with the complex business environment and interdependency of various tasks; many of the work in the organizations are being done in teams. Teams have members with complementary skills, which give rise to synergistic effect through a coordinated effort. According to the study conducted by Shaw et al., 2000, Kiffin-Peterson and Cordery, 2003, it is beneficial to consider individual preference to work in team or alone while selecting the members. This phenomenon allows each member of the team to maximize his/her strengths and minimize his/her weaknesses. Team effectiveness refers to the members of the team work together effectively to realize the common goal(s). Team work is very essential for the organizations. It is a driver of competitive improvement. Teamwork is the ability to achieve uncommon results using common people by directing individual objectives towards organizational objectives.

Both Mc Gregor and Likert (1960) listed a large number of characteristics of effective work groups or teams. In 1987, Dyer summarized eleven characteristics of an effective work team suggested by McGregor and twenty four characteristics of an effective work group suggested by Likert. The ten main characteristics of effective teams as suggested both by McGregor and Likert are given in Table-1.

Table 1. Characteristic of Effective Work Teams
(McGregor and Likert)

Sl. No.	Characteristics
1	Commitment and inspiring goals
2	Role clarity
3	Self-disclosure
4	Openness to feedback
5	Competence
6	Creativity with constructive conformity
7	Collaboration/support/trust
8	Congruence between individual and group goals
9	Supportive leadership
10	Management of power

Bell, French and Vohra (1999) put the characteristics of an effective team in the following way:

- Clear Purpose: Defined and accepted vision, mission, goal, and an action plan.
- Informality: Informal, comfortable, and relaxed.
- Participation: Much discussion with everyone encouraged to participate.
- Listening: Use of effective listening techniques such as questioning, paraphrasing, and summarizing.
- Civilized Disagreement: Team is comfortable with disagreement; does not avoid, smooth over, or suppress conflict.
- Consensus Decision Making: Substantial agreement through thorough discussion, avoidance of voting.
- Open Communications: Feelings seen as legitimate with few hidden agenda.
- Clear Roles and Work Assignments: Clear expectations and work is evenly divided.

- Shared Leadership: In addition to a formal leader, everyone shares in effective leadership behaviours.
- External Relations: The team pays attention to developing outside relationships, resources, and credibility.
- Style Diversity: Team has broad spectrum of group process and task skills.
- Self Assessment: Periodic examination of how well the team is functioning.

Katzenbach and Smith, 1993 have said that team consists of small number of people committed to a common purpose, performance goals and approach for which they are mutually accountable. As per Johnson and Johnson, 1995, social interdependence exists when individuals share common goals; each individual's outcomes are affected by actions of the others. Johnson and Johnson, 1999 have also opined that effective interdependence depends on the intrinsic motivation of team members and the force it places on the team in achieving the desired common goals. Interdependence can be positive resulting in proactive interaction or it can be negative resulting in opposition or conflicting interaction. Interdependence can also be neutral resulting in no interaction. Effectiveness of team working depends on the meaning of team (Fincham and Rhodes, 2005).

Team effectiveness can be conceived from several angles, which are as follows:

- Taking the concept of Johari Window (1955), an effective team is one in which people give their opinion and comments without hesitation; listen to and examine others opinions, comments, and feedback given by colleagues at all levels; and are sensitive to the needs of others.
- Three main characteristics of team functioning such as clarity of roles of different team members', cohesion, trust and closeness; confrontation; and collaboration lead to team effectiveness.
- Team effectiveness can also be understood in terms of four main characteristics of team empowerment like clarity of roles of different members of the team; autonomy of team; support provided to the team in terms of resources; and accountability of the team to achieve the goals to which commitment has been made.
- The concept of power is also helpful in understanding team effectiveness. From this angle team effectiveness is widely distribution

of power and the members of the team enjoy more persuasive than coercive power.

Team building is the way to make the teams more effective. The various approaches to team building are Johari Window, Role Negotiation, Team Role, Behaviour Modification, Simulation, Action Research and Appreciative Enquiry.

To deal with both global competition and company downsizing, multinational firms are increasingly using Self Managing Work Teams (SMWTs) in their foreign affiliates.

Payne, Benson, and Finegold, 2009 have identified five attributes of high performing team such as knowledge, information, power, incentive, and opportunity/time. They have argued that these attributes will promote board effectiveness, which in turn influence corporate financial performance. They investigated the relationships by using combined survey and archival sources of data for 210 Fortune 1000 companies. Findings indicated that most team effectiveness attributes are associated with higher levels of board effectiveness as rated by the board directors, and that board effectiveness is significantly related to corporate financial performance.

Verma, Rangnekar and Barua, 2011 conducted a study in Indian public and private service manufacturing organizations to know the perceptions of executives regarding the effectiveness of their team. They studied the relationship between need pattern and team effectiveness. They have suggested that management should be concerned for the development of unique capacities and potentialities of each individual rather than common objective for all the members.

Pivman, Hiltz, Starr and Wang, 2013 have opined that in partially distributed teams, where some members are co-located while others are geographically distant, co-located members tend to treat one another as a preferential 'Us' versus treating distant members as the outsiders, 'Them'. They studied the extent to which 'Us' versus 'Them'were reported as a problem across a wide number of organizational partially distributed teams and its significant relationship with team effectiveness. Cole, Carter and Zhen, 2013 examined the effect of (in) congruence between leaders' and teams' power distance values on team effectiveness. They hypothesized that the (in) congruence between these values would differentially predict team effectiveness, with procedural justice climate

serving as a mediator. Using multisource data and polynomial regression, they found that similarities (and differences) between leaders' and their teams' power distance values can have consequential effects on teams' justice climate and, ultimately, their effectiveness (viz., team performance and team organizational citizenship behavior). They recommended that, to fully understand the implications of power distance; one should consider the multiple perspectives of both leaders and team members.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Realizing the importance of team effectiveness which is very urgent and essential for the success of every organization and after extensive review of literature, this piece of work has been preceded with the following objectives:

- To assess the existence of team effectiveness in the sample organizations.
- To identify important factors leading to team effectiveness.
- To analyze the views of management respondents with regard to team effectiveness.
- To study the inter relationship between the factors of team effectiveness.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

Based on the objectives, the following hypotheses have been proposed to be tested.

- The distribution of variables (as mentioned in the questionnaire) is the same across categories of age of the respondents.
- The distribution of variables is the same across categories of gender of the respondents.
- The distribution of variables is the same across categories of designation of the respondents.
- Largest clusters (derived by K means cluster) of respondents give the highest importance to the variable i.e. problem solving.
- There is a positive relationship between recognizing each other's strength and handling conflict.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Sources of Data

The data for the present study were collected from two sources i.e. primary and secondary. (i)The primary data referring to the practical aspects of team effectiveness were collected by administering structured questionnaire to the officials (white-collared employees) especially top, middle and lower level managers and wherever felt necessary interviews were held with concerned officials to elicit relevant data. (ii) Data relating to the history of the organizations, size and structure of manpower, and team work were collected from secondary sources like companies' records, leaflets, bulletin, and websites etc.

Sample Technique and Size

The past researchers on team effectiveness have suggested collecting data from diverse samples to yield variability in responses. Researcher contacted various Human Resource Heads of twenty organizations from four sectors (such as information technology, telecom, manufacturing and banking sectors) both telephonically and through e-mail. The heads were briefed about the study. Finally, data were collected from six private companies in India representing information technology, telecom, manufacturing and banking sectors. Random and stratified (strata: male and female) sampling technique was followed. Out of a final sample of 514 respondents, 150 (29%) were from IT industry, 200 (39%) were from Telecom industry, 104 (20%) were from Manufacturing industry, and 60(12%) were from the banking industry. The study focussed on white-collared managerial population of these organizations. Proper attention was paid in the selection of the sample.

Research Design

Exploratory research design was followed.

Instrument

The instrument of team effectiveness designed by Prof. Udai Pareek and Prof. Surabhi Purohit, 2010 was used for the study. The instrument contains thirty bipolar items, each with a 5-point rating scale. For example

under the first variable i.e. mutual trust, the extreme number 1 indicates that members of your team are very suspicious of each other and number 5 indicates that you assess the team members as high trusting. Number 2 and 4 indicate less suspicious and high trust. Number 3 means that either you are not sure whether there is trust or suspicion, or it is clearly visible either way.

The other variables are Communication, Recognizing each other's strength, Taking responsibilities, Goal of the team, Utilizing available human resources, Handling conflicts, Leadership, Conformity demanded, Decision process, External linkages, Tolerance of disagreement, Team assessment, Work assignment, Team member satisfaction, Mutual support, Active listening, Temperament of team members, Encouraging involvement and participation of members, Team climate, Attitude of members, Technical/Managerial/academic expertise, Commitment by the team members for action, Credit or reward in the organization given to, Collaboration, Team cohesion, Creativity, Individual functionality, Team output, and Problem solving. With respect to reliability, Equal-length Spearman and Guttman split-half for a group of 122 was found to be 0.78.

DATA ANALYSIS

Out of the total respondents of 514, 313 were males (60.9%) and rest 201(39.1%) were females. The average age of the respondents was 37 and sample consisted of respondents from a fairly well distributed age-group varying between 25 to 54 years, with a predominance of respondents less than 50 years. With respect to the hierarchical levels, 6.2 percent respondents were Assistant Managers, 23.9 percent were Managers, 36.6 were Senior Managers, and 33.3 were in Top Management positions.

Exploratory Factor analysis (objective was to identify factors based on data and to maximize the amount of variance explained) was conducted using Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis and Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization and 12 most important and relevant variables were found out. The rule was that variables having factor loading of 0.59 or more than that were considered. Other variables were rejected. The variables are as follows:

1. Goal of the team
2. Tolerance of disagreement
3. Problem solving
4. Team assessment
5. Temperament of the team

6. Recognizing each other's strength
7. Handling conflict
8. Attitude of members
9. Taking responsibilities
10. Active listening
11. Utilizing available human resources
12. Leadership

Table 2. Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.630	12

The alpha coefficient for the twelve variables was found to be 0.630 (Table-2) indicating internal consistency among the variables.

Table 3. Item Statistics

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Goal of the team	3.5117	1.03018	514
Tolerance of disagreement	3.0097	1.09665	514
Problem solving	3.5525	1.09676	514
Team assessment	3.4844	1.06547	514
Temperament of team	3.8230	.954	514
Recognizing each other's strengths	3.4883	1.07282	514
Handling conflict	3.8872	.96271	514
Attitude of members	3.6070	.94962	514
Taking responsibilities	3.4903	.92238	514
Active listening	3.0467	.80311	514
Utilizing available human resources	3.6595	.98271	514
Leadership	3.5486	.92114	514

The item statistics for the twelve variables is exhibited in Table-3, from which it was found that item named "handling conflict" was having the highest mean of 3.8872 and item named "tolerance of disagreement" was having the lowest mean of 3.0097.

The item total statistics for the variables is exhibited in Table-4.

From the below Table-5 it was observed that the Hypothesis No-1 i.e. "The distribution of the variables is the same across categories of age of the respondents" is partially proved. This implies employees' age is contributing towards effective team management except variables like "recognizing each other's strength" and "active listening".

As shown in Table-6, the variable "goal of the team" is given highest

Table 4. Item Total Statistics

Items	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Goal of the team	38.5973	22.296	.470	.570
Tolerance of disagreement	39.0992	23.103	.344	.595
Problem solving	38.5564	21.624	.500	.561
Team assessment	38.6245	23.412	.328	.599
Temperament of team	38.2860	25.643	.142	.633
Recognizing each other's strengths	38.6206	23.526	.313	.602
Handling conflict	38.2218	24.130	.304	.604
Attitude of members	38.5019	25.553	.154	.631
Taking responsibilities	38.6187	25.188	.204	.622
Active listening	39.0623	26.382	.109	.635
Utilizing available human resources	38.4494	.25.332	.165	.629
Leadership	38.5603	24.910	.236	.616

Table 5. Nonparametric Tests: Independent Samples: Across Age

Sl.No	Null Hypothesis	Test	Asymptotic Significance (Sig. Level=.05)	Decision
1	The distribution of goal of the team is the same across categories of age	Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.002	Reject Ho
2	The distribution of tolerance of disagreements the same across categories of age	Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.049	Reject Ho
3	The distribution of problem solving is the same across categories of age	Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.001	Reject Ho
4	The distribution of team assessment is the same across categories of age	Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.018	Reject Ho
5	The distribution of temperament of the team is the same across categories of age	Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.015	Reject Ho
6	The distribution of recognizing each other's strengthsis the same across categories of age	Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.509	Retain Ho
7	The distribution of handling conflict is the same across categories of age	Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.000	Reject Ho
8	The distribution of attitude of the members is the same across categories of age	Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.003	Reject Ho
9	The distribution of taking responsibilities is the same across categories of age	Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.003	Reject Ho
10	The distribution of active listening is the same across categories of age	Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.818	Retain Ho

| 11 | The distribution of utilizing available human resources is the same across categories of age | Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test | .000 | Reject Ho |
| 12 | The distribution of leadership is the same across categories of age | Independent- Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test | .000 | Reject Ho |

Table 6.Nonparametric Tests: K Independent Samples: Across Age

Ranks

	Age	N	Mean Rank
Goal of the team	25-29	13	326.88
	30-34	37	177.03
	35-39	202	267.12
	40-44	155	245.31
	45-49	103	274.11
	50-54	4	335.00
	Total	514	
Tolerance of disagreement	25-29	13	202.08
	30-34	37	247.47
	35-39	202	248.32
	40-44	155	253.59
	45-49	103	286.54
	50-54	4	397.50
	Total	514	

Problem solving	25-29	13	305.58
	30-34	37	322.11
	35-39	202	274.85
	40-44	155	232.67
	45-49	103	229.33
	50-54	4	315.00
	Total	514	
Team assessment	25-29	13	252.23
	30-34	37	211.88
	35-39	202	280.74
	40-44	155	236.15
	45-49	103	258.37
	50-54	4	328.00
	Total	514	
Temperament of team	25-29	13	377.04
	30-34	37	216.85
	35-39	202	250.39
	40-44	155	256.91
	45-49	103	270.73
	50-54	4	286.50
	Total	514	

Recognizing each other's strengths	25-29	13	285.92
	30-34	37	234.24
	35-39	202	263.42
	40-44	155	261.72
	45-49	103	241.45
	50-54	4	331.00
	Total	514	
Handling conflicts	25-29	13	379.42
	30-34	37	220.39
	35-39	202	247.70
	40-44	155	288.00
	45-49	103	228.49
	50-54	4	264.50
	Total	514	
Attitude of Members	25-29	13	286.92
	30-34	37	217.24
	35-39	202	258.95
	40-44	155	235.06
	45-49	103	293.86
	50-54	4	394.00
	Total	514	

Taking Responsibilities	25-29	13	307.42
	30-34	37	261.58
	35-39	202	282.28
	40-44	155	239.95
	45-49	103	224.06
	50-54	4	347.00
	Total	514	
Active Listening	25-29	13	280.96
	30-34	37	260.14
	35-39	202	254.23
	40-44	155	267.69
	45-49	103	244.79
	50-54	4	254.50
	Total	514	
Utilizingavailable human resources	25-29	13	202.15
	30-34	37	208.47
	35-39	202	276.79
	40-44	155	230.78
	45-49	103	276.37
	50-54	4	466.50
	Total	514	

Leadership			
	25-29	13	277.42
	30-34	37	156.54
	35-39	202	270.14
	40-44	155	239.88
	45-49	103	289.93
	50-54	4	336.00
	Total	514	

emphasis by 50-54 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 30-34 year age group of employees. The variable "tolerance of disagreement" is given highest emphasis by 50-54 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 25-29 year age group of employees. The variable "problem solving" is given highest emphasis by 30-34 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 45-49 year age group of employees. The variable "team assessment" is given highest emphasis by 50-54 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 30-34 year age group of employees. The variable "temperament of team" is given highest emphasis by 25-29 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 30-34 year age group of employees. The variable "recognizing each other's strength" is given highest emphasis by 50-54 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 30-34 year age group of employees. The variable "handling conflict" is given highest emphasis by 25-29 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 30-34 year age group of employees. The variable "attitude of members" is given highest emphasis by 50-54 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 30-34 year age group of employees. The variable "taking responsibilities" is given highest emphasis by 50-54 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 45-49 year age group of employees. The variable "active listening" is given highest emphasis by 25-29 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 45-49 year age group of employees. The variable "utilizing available human resources" is given highest emphasis by 50-54 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 25-29 year age group of employees. The variable "leadership" is given highest emphasis by 50-54 year age group of employees and least emphasis by 30-34 year age group of employees.

Table 7. Nonparametric Tests: Independent Samples: Across Gender

Sl.No	Null Hypothesis	Test	Asymptotic Significance (Sig. Level=.05)	Decision
1	The distribution of goal of the team is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.087	Retain Ho
2	The distribution of tolerance of disagreement is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.662	Retain Ho

3	The distribution of problem solving is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.001	Reject Ho
4	The distribution of team assessment is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.631	Retain Ho
5	The distribution of temperament of the team is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.229	Retain Ho
6	The distribution of rec-ognizing each other's strengths is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.712	Retain Ho
7	The distribution of handling conflict is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.389	Retain Ho
8	The distribution of attitude of the mem-bers is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.081	Retain Ho
9	The distribution of taking responsibili-ties is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.498	Retain Ho
10	The distribution of active listening is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.080	Retain Ho
11	The distribution of utilizing available hu-man resources is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.000	Reject Ho
12	The distribution of leadership is the same across categories of gender	Independent-Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.197	Retain Ho

From the above Table-7 it was observed that the **Hypothesis No-2 i.e. "The distribution of the variables is the same across categories of gender of the respondents" is partially proved**. This implies employees' gender is also contributing towards effective team management, with respect to variables like problem solving and utilizing available human resources. This indicates both male and female employees have separated and diversified ways of looking at problems.

Table 8. Nonparametric Tests: Independent Samples: Across Designation

Sl.No	Null Hypothesis	Test	Asymptotic Significance (Sig. Level=.05)	Decision
1	The distribution of goal of the team is the same across categories of designation	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.000	Reject Ho
2	The distribution of tolerance of disagreement is the same across categories of designation	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.041	Reject Ho
3	The distribution of problem solving is the same across categories of designation	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.000	Reject Ho
4	The distribution of team assessment is the same across categories of designation	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.000	Reject Ho
5	The distribution of temperament of the team is the same across categories of designation	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.068	Retain Ho
6	The distribution of recognizing each other's strengths is the same across categories of designation	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.000	Reject Ho
7	The distribution of handling conflict is the same across categories of designation	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.095	Retain Ho

8	The distribution of attitude of the members is the same across categories of designation	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.827	Retain Ho
9	The distribution of taking responsibilities is the same across categories of designation	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.000	Reject Ho
10	The distribution of active listening is the same across categories of age	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.006	Reject Ho
11	The distribution of utilizing available human resources is the same across categories of designation	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.005	Reject Ho
12	The distribution of leadership is the same across categories of designation	Independent-Samples-Kruskal Wallis Test	.006	Reject Ho

From the above Table-8 it was found that the **Hypothesis No-3 i.e. "The distribution of the variables is the same across categories of designation of the respondents" is partially proved.** Employees' designation is very well affecting variables like goal of the team, tolerance of disagreement, problem solving, team assessment, recognizing each other's strength, taking responsibilities, active listening, utilizing available human resources, and leadership.

Table 9. Final Cluster Centers

Variables	Cluster		
	1	2	3
Goal of the team	2.80	3.47	4.16
Tolerance of disagreement	2.53	2.39	3.79
Problem solving	2.93	3.02	4.40
Team assessment	2.46	3.90	4.15
Temperament of team	3.22	4.42	4.01
Recognizing each other's strengths	3.59	2.58	3.92
Handling conflict	3.73	3.60	4.19
Attitude of members	3.56	3.23	3.87

Taking responsibilities	3.70	2.56	3.84
Active listening	3.03	2.72	3.25
Utilizing available human resources	3.59	3.40	3.87
Leadership	3.32	3.57	3.74

By using K-Means Cluster the above result (Table-9) was found out.

Table 10. Number of Cases in Each Cluster

Cluster	No. of Respondents
1	184
2	120
3	210
Total	514

From Table-9 and Table-10, it was found that Cluster-3 (210 respondents) has given the maximum importance to the variable "problem solving". Cluster-1 (184 respondents) has given major importance to "handling conflict"and finally cluster-2 (120 respondents) has given the most importance to "temperament of team". **This also partially proves Hypothesis No-4, i.e. "Largest clusters highest importance to the variable i.e. problem solving".**

As shown in Table-11 the correlation coefficient between "Handling conflict" and "Recognizing each other's strength" was found to be 0.469 and the P value for the two-tailed test of significance was less than 0.0005. This implies the variable, "Handling conflict"exhibited significant positive relationship with "Recognizing each other's strength" (r= 0.469; p<0.01).This implies that there is a positive correlation between the above two variables. **This proves Hypothesis No-5 i.e. "There is a positive relationship between recognizing each other's strength and handling conflict".** Similarly there is a positive correlation between "Problem solving" and "Goal of the team" having r value of 0.455**.**

CONCLUSION AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

For world-class results in a corporate environment, an organization needs to have teams that can face all challenges. Joint efforts always attain and generate the best results. Winning teams harness their members' talents and energy in order to experience synergistic effects. Putting in other words, when a team is working well, the total is far greater than the sum of its parts. The findings of this study significantly contribute

Table 11.Correlations

Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	1											
2	.415**	1										
3	.455**	.355**	1									
4	.354**	.186**	.309**	1								
5	.182**	-0.05	.161**	.313**	1							
6	0.031	.138**	.176**	0.038	-.153**	1						
7	.163**	.195**	.183**	.249**	0.078	.469**	1					
8	0.055	0.069	.132**	-0.01	.158**	0.02	-.209**	1				
9	-0	0.086	.233**	-0.08	-0.083	.354**	0.076	.254**	1			
10	.167**	0.055	.192**	-0.09	0.057	0.053	0.014	0.006	.124**	1		
11	0.055	0.057	0.077	0.059	0.015	.223**	.114**	.220**	0.01	-0.02	1	
12	.314**	.112*	0.054	.213**	0.04	.202**	0.079	.095*	0.043	-0.02	-0	1

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

in advancing the body of knowledge on team effectiveness. The study indicates handling conflict is very important for team effectiveness.The findings reveal age difference (with respect to goal of the team, tolerance of disagreement, problem solving, team assessment, temperament of the team, handling conflict, attitude of the members, taking responsibilities, utilizing available human resources, and leadership); gender difference (with respect to problem solving and utilizing available human resources) and designation difference (with respect to goal of the team, tolerance of disagreement, problem solving, team assessment, recognizing each other's strengths, taking responsibilities, active listening, utilizing available human resources, and leadership) play a major role in determining team effectiveness. The study also reveals that team members handle conflict by giving due respect to each other's strengths. This is very essential for enhancing team effectiveness. Respondents having the lower age have responded more emotionally than practically.The past literatures report non significance of age in a computer mediated environment, which contradicts the present finding. As the study suggests, the human resource utilization is not proper with respect to gender. There are also diversified opinions with respect to various designations maintained in the organizations. This is quite obvious that employees at different levels have realized the importance of team effectiveness differently, but in a positive way.

SUGGESTIONS

The results of the study suggest some important steps for more effective team management which are as follows:

- The leader should convey a clear message to the team members regarding the organizations expectations at the time of joining. He or she must ensure that the team members understand what the team has been created for and continuously underline these objectives via internal communications.
- Team members must acknowledge their comprehension of and participation in the achievement of the organizational objectives. They must know how the team is supposed to help the organization to achieve its' targets.
- The team leader must ensure that the team members are sufficiently knowledgeable, skilled and capable to face the issues for which the team has been created. He or she should build complete trust on the team members and delegate the responsibilities.

- The team leader must ensure that all performing team members perceive their service as valuable to the organization. He or she must find out what it takes to keep the team motivated, and establish workable means of fulfilling reasonable expectations.
- The organization should reward and recognize team members who have done their job efficiently.
- The team leader must ensure that the team has appropriate resources, initiatives, and support required to attain its goals. The organization must, in turn, empower the team with sufficient authority to accomplish its charter. The team leader should build capability in the team: Learn to transfer skills to team-members who can then take the task forward from him/her.
- Sometimes, team members may do or say things that seem out of synch with the team's overall mission and goals. This can result in resentment and confusion. Then it is the duty of the team leader to establish how these words or actions were meant to add to the team's ability to fulfill its set objectives. If the reasons are not immediately apparent, he or she should ask for clarifications to avoid clashes.
- Team leaders must also possess enough patience. All teams do not perform at 100% efficiency once they have been presented with their targets and objectives. Also, some individual team members may not move as fast as others, even though they do not lack capability or motivation. In this situation, the team leader must take on the role of a mentor and ensure that such members have sufficient breathing space, nevertheless keeping them focused on the deadline. Let us move together and let us speak together.
- All team members should feel free to ask for guidance on a specific decision or task. Such an attitude creates better relationships and helps the team succeed faster. In this spirit, the team leader must also assign the right people within the team to make decisions, and the appropriate people to comply with those decisions.
- Team members must share views, ideas, experiences and thoughts with other team members. Sharing is significant to team development, since a team is a compilation of uniquely thinking individuals. After accomplishment of a task or goal, team members must share the success as a unit.
- There is no place for the blame-game in a cutting edge team. Problems will arise and must be seen as means to evaluate progress and

obtain knowledge. Setbacks should never been seen as opportunities to accuse others.

- The leader must go for continuous evaluation of the team. Evaluation serves as a barometer for measuring both progress toward results and achievement of results.

LIMITATIONS AND SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Despite the strengths and results, this study has certain limitations. The results of the study cannot be generalized across industries, keeping the sample size in view. Also the results of this study are based on cross-section data. For example employees spending less number of years in organization may not give their best effort as a team member. Hence it is impossible to draw conclusion regarding causality. Longitudinal research is needed to examine the causal direction of relationships. This can be the scope for further research.

REFERENCES

Bell, C. H., French, W. L., & Vohra, V. (1999). *Organization Development*. Pearson Education, New Delhi.

Bjornal, E., Eriksonn, T., & Knockaert, M. (2011). The impact of top management team characteristics and board strategic involvement on team effectiveness in high-tech start-ups. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Proceedings*. Academy of Management.

Cole, M. S., Carter, M. Z., Zhen, Z. (2013). Leader-team congruence in power distance values and team effectiveness: The mediating role of procedural justice climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 98(6), 962-973.

Coper, C. L., Dewe, P. J., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2001). *Organizational stress: A review and critique of theory, research and applications*. Sage Publications, Carlifornia.

Dyer William G (1987). *Team building: Issues and alternatives*. Addison Wesley Longman, New York.

Fincham, R., & Rhodes, P. (2005). *Principles of organizational behaviour*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Gladstein, D. (1984). Group in context: A model of task group effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 29, 497-517.

Guzzo, R. A. (1995). Introduction: At the intersection of team effectiveness and decision making. In Guzzo RA, Salas E (Eds.), *Team Effectiveness and Decision Making in Organizations.* Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Ilgen, D. R. (1986). Laboratory research: A question of when, not if. In Locke EA(Ed.), *Generalizing from Lab to Field Settings*, 257-267. MA: Heath, Lexington.

Ilgen, D. R., Major, D. A., Hollenbeck J. R., & Sego, D. J. (1993). Team research in the 1990s. In Chemers, M. M., & Ayman, R. (Eds.). *Leadership Theory and Research: Prescriptive and Directions*, 245-270. CA: Academic Press, San Diego.

Johnson, D. W., and Johnson RT (1995) In Bunker, B. and Rubin JZ (Eds) *Conflict, cooperation, and justice*: *Essays inspired by the work of Morton Deutsch*.CA: Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning*, (5th Edn.). Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Johnson, S. D., Suriya, C., Won, Y. S., Berrett, J. V., & La, F. J. (2002) Teamdevelopment and group processes of virtual learning teams. *Computer and Education.* Elsevier, 39(4), 379-393.

Johnson, S. T. (1993. Work teams: what's ahead in work design and rewardsmanagement? *Compensation and Benefits Review,* 25 (2), 35-41.

Kalra, S. K. (1998). Human potential management: Time to move beyond the concept of human resource management? *Journal of European Industrial Training,* 21(5), 1-4.

Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the highperformance organization*. Harvard Business School, Boston.

Kiffin-Peterson, S. A., & Cordery, J. L. (2003). Trust, individualism, and job characteristics of employee preference for teamwork. *International journal of Human Resource Management,* 14(1), 93-116.

Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. (1999). Beyond self-management: Antecedents and consequences of team empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 58-74.

Lim, S., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 95-107.

Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (1997). The Impact of cultural values on employee resistance to teams: Toward a model of globalized self-managing work team effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review,* 23(3), 730-757.

Mathieu, J., Maynard M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management* 34, 410-476.

Matthew, W., Misty, L. L., Woehr, D. J., Bullard, L. G., Felder, R. M.,

Finelli, C. J., Layton, R. A., Pomeranz, H. R., & Schmucker, D. G. (2012)

The comprehensive assessment of team member effectiveness: Development of a behaviorally anchored rating scale for self- and peer evaluation. *Academy of Management Learning and Education,* 11(4), 609-630.

McClelland, D. C., & Burnham, D. H. (1976). Power is the great motivator. *Harvard Business Review,* 54(2), 100-110.

McClurg, L. N. (2001) Team rewards: How far have we come? *Human Resource Management* 40(1), 73-86.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. McGraw-Hill, New York.

Mathieu, J. E., Heffner, T. S., Goodwin, G. F, Salas E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2000). The influence of   shared mental models on team process and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 85, 273-283.

Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (2005). Aggression in the workplace: A social-psychological perspective. In S. Fox and P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counter Productive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*, 13-40. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Pareek, U. (2002). *Training instruments in HRD and OD* (2nd edn.) Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Ltd, New Delhi.

Payne, G. T., Benson, G. S., & Finegold, D. L. (2009). Corporate board attributes, team effectiveness and financial performance. *Journal of Management Studies,* 46(4), 704-723.

Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for 'nice'? Think again. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19, 7-18.

Privman, R., Hiltz, S. R., & Wang, Y. (2013). In-Group (Us) versus out-group (Them) dynamics and effectiveness in partially distributed teams. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication,* 56(1), 33-49.

Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Organizational Behavior*. Prentice-Hall, NJ.

Ross, T. M., Jones, E. C., & Adams, S G. (2008). Can team effectiveness be predicted? *Team Performance Management*, 14(5/6), 248-268.

Shaw, J. D., Duffy, M. K., & Stark, E. M. (2000). Interdependence and preference for group work: Main and congruence effects on the satisfaction and performance of group members. *Journal of Management*, 2, 259-279.

Shet, K., , Kate, L., & Waller , M. J. (2013). The role of positive affectivity in team effectiveness during crises. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour,* 34(4), 473-491.

Stahl MJ (1986)*Managerial and Technical Motivation: Assessing Needs for Achievement, Power and Affiliation*. Praeger, New York.

Shonk, J. A. (1990). *Team-based organizations: Developing a successful team environment*.

Irwin Professional Publishing, New York.

Sperry, L. (2009). Mobbing and bullying: The influence of individual, work Group and organizational dynamics on abusive workplace behavior. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 61, 190-201.

Sundstrom, E., De Meuse, K. P., & Futrell, D. (1990). Work teams: Applications and effectiveness. *American Psychologist*, 45, 120-133.

Vandenberg, R., Richardson, H., & Eastman, L. (1999). The impact of high involvement work practices on organizational effectiveness: A second-order latent variable approach. *Group and Organization Management,* 24, 30-39.

Verma, N., Rangnekar, S., & Barua, M. K. (2011). Team effectiveness in Indian organizations: A comparative analysis of public and private sector. *Delhi Business Review,* 13(2), 43-54.

Walton, R. E. (1985). From c-ontrolto commitment in the workplace. *Harvard Business Review,* 63, 76-84.

WelUns, R. S., Wilson, R., Katz, A. J., Laughlin, P., Dayjr, C. R., & Price, D. (1990). *Self-directed team: A study of current practices.* PA: DDI, Pittsbtirgh.

Yang, S. B., & Choi, S. O. (2009). Employee empowerment and team performance: Autonomy, responsibility, information and creativity. *Team Performance management*, 15(5/6), 289-301.