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CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

TEAMWORK DIVIDES THE TASK AND DOUBLES THE SUCCESS

This chapter provides an overview of the literature relevant to this study. It discusses literature interrelated with team characteristics and team effectiveness. This chapter covers five topics: teams, work team, team effectiveness, characteristics of a team and other aspects that influence team effectiveness.

2.1 TEAMS
The importance of team work has been realized in the organisational system and social system since several centuries. A team is defined as “a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to common purpose, set of performance goals and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable” Katzenbach JR, Smith DK (1993)¹. Moreover, teams are recognized by members and non-members as “a social entity”, rooted within an organizational context Devine (2002)². A team is also referred as a small group whose members have complementary skills, have a common purpose, apply performance goals, and who accept mutual accountability Proehl (1997)³. Teams can be identified into different types, such as, Work teams, management teams, Parallel teams and project teams. Katzenbach JR & Smith DK (1993)⁴; Mohrman et al., (1995)⁵: Sundstrom et al (1990)⁶, refers work team as service and production teams. Sundstrom, DeMeuse, and Futrell, (1990)⁷ classified teams according to their levels of integration (i.e., the relation of the team to the greater organization) and degree of specialization (i.e., how specialized their activity is in comparison to other work teams). As such, the classified system included four types of teams, advice/involvement teams, production/services teams, project/development teams and
action/negotiation teams with varying high and low degrees of integration and specialization.

This study is focused on work teams which are engaged in production/service in IT and ITES sector.

2.2 WORK TEAMS
When discussing about teams, most people reflect on work teams. Work teams are continuing work units responsible for producing goods or services. Their membership is typically stable, usually fulltime and well defined (Cohen, 1997). Work teams are found both in manufacturing and services sectors.

A work team is a group of interdependent individuals who have complementary skills and are committed to a shared, meaningful purpose and specific goals. Katzenbach (1993); Dyer (1984); Guzzo & Dickinson (1996) say that work teams have a common, collaborative work approach, clear roles and responsibilities, and hold themselves mutually accountable for the team’s performance. Rousseau (1983) defines a work team as "multiple individuals acting as a bounded whole in order to get something done". Sanborn (1992) takes teams as "a group of diverse people united by a common purpose, who are cooperating to achieve quality results and experience synergy.

Groups become teams when they develop a sense of shared commitment and strive for synergy among members (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993). The presence of interdependency is a key characteristic of work teams and is what distinguishes a work team from a work group (Guzzo, 1986). Teams are special cases of groups. A team is a more highly-developed form of a work group in terms of possessing the characteristics of autonomy and shared responsibilities (Cohen & Daily, 1997; Guzzo & Dickson, 1996). A team is a group that has developed a high degree of interdependency and integration (Cohen & Daily, 1997). Although many researchers take great care to
distinguish between ‘Teams’ and ‘Groups’, in this research the terms are used interchangeably and no distinction is made between Group and Team.

The current study uses the following definition for team in general and work team in particular: “a collection of individuals who are interdependent in their tasks, who share responsibility for outcomes, who see themselves and who are seen by others as an intact social entity embedded in one or more larger social systems” (Cohen & Bailey, 1997)\textsuperscript{19}.

As software development is a labor- and knowledge-intensive task, teamwork in software projects has been long acknowledged as a crucial criterion for the successful design and deployment of software projects (Jiang et al., 2003\textsuperscript{20}; Gottschalk and Solli-Sather, 2007\textsuperscript{21}). Articles by (Fiore and Salas, 2004\textsuperscript{22} and Bowers, Salas and Jentsch, 2006\textsuperscript{23}) provide overviews of the current status of research on teams. Many studies have been conducted on teams in IT and ITES sectors abroad. For instance, (Kang, Yang and Chris Rowley 2006\textsuperscript{24}, Straub 1991\textsuperscript{25}, Zahnis, 1990\textsuperscript{26}, Jeffrey, 1987\textsuperscript{27}; Mills, 1983\textsuperscript{28}; etc). However, very few studies have been conducted in India relating to teams in IT and ITES sector.

2.3 TEAM EFFECTIVENESS

Effective teamwork will not take the place of knowing how to do the job or how to manage the work. Poor teamwork, however, can prevent effective final performance. And it can also prevent team members from gaining satisfaction in being a member of a team and the organization. (Robert F. Bales, 2010\textsuperscript{29})

Many researchers and academicians define team effectiveness. (Sundstrom, 1999)\textsuperscript{30} defines team effectiveness as: “the extent to which a work team meets the performance expectations of key counterparts—managers, customers, and others—while continuing to meet members’ expectations of work with the team”. This definition emphasizes the importance of performance results the
team delivers as well as the processes used within the team to achieve those results.

*Advanced Learner’s Oxford dictionary* defines effectiveness as: “having the desired effect: producing the intended results … making a strong and pleasing impression”. (Gibson, Zellmer – Bruhn & Schwab, 2003) describes effectiveness as number of errors made.

It is said that the effectiveness of a team is determined by the extent to which it “meets its goals, maintain the satisfaction of its members and survives” (Belbin, 2004).

Timely decision making capacity of the team makes a team effective and the work teams, “that use systematic decision-making processes are much more likely to be effective than teams that do not” (Mohrman, Cohen, and Mohrman, Jr. 1995). The effective teams had a more dramatic style of decision making, with decisions made in a forum which was interpersonally non-threatening, with encouragement of diverse thinking, facilitating more participation by members, an open attitude for change and a shared concern for excellence in completing the task, as well as continued evaluation of performance (Kellett, 1993).

Henderson and Walkinshaw (2002), found that effectiveness pertains specifically to the accomplishment of the goals, milestones, and objectives as defined by the requirements of the context or the stakeholders.

The effectiveness also encompasses the quality of the final product and the degree of enjoyment the members had of the project experience (Cohen & Bailey, 1997).
(Elsje Scott and Michael Pollock, 2006) summarize and say that team effectiveness can be determined by:

- *Enhanced productivity* as a result of the increased levels of interactions between team members arising from teamwork.
- The degree to which team members enjoy the project experience. (*job satisfaction*)
- The quality of the final product produced by the team in achieving the desired goal. (*Stakeholder’s satisfaction*).

2.4 FACTORS AFFECTING TEAM EFFECTIVENESS:

Researchers have found many factors that play a prominent role in improving team effectiveness, such as leadership (Kahai, Sosik & Avolio, 1997; Schminke & Wells, 1999), team formation (Early & Mosakowski, 2000), team structure (Stewart & Barrick, 2000) and team member’s characteristics (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert & Mount, 1998). Effectiveness of a team depends upon various characteristics possessed by the team and the team members. Moreover, the organizational climate and environment in which the team functions, plays a major role in determining the effectiveness of a team.

2.4.1 COMMUNICATION

Team communication is defined as the information, thoughts and expressions shared by more than three members of a group. Whether the group is an informal gathering, a religious organization or a business, each member is a part of a team. Team communication involves the challenge of effectively communicating in such a way that team members hear the same message (Joey Papa, 2009).

It has been found that there is an evidence of a positive link between good communication and team performance (MacMillan et al., 2004). Ability and willingness to communicate freely within the team is expected from each team member.
member for smooth functioning of team. It is said that trust building activities such as open communication, honesty in behaviour and delivering upon commitments contributes to team effectiveness via increased performance, job satisfaction, and decreased job stress (Staples 2001)\textsuperscript{45}. Sarah says that, Communication is perhaps the most critical team process. It is invariably found that the majority of teams want communication to be improved. What team members often fail to take on board is that they have individual and collective responsibility for making this happen. (Sarah, 2009)\textsuperscript{46}

2.4.2 INDIVIDUAL GOAL / TEAM GOAL / CLARITY IN GOAL

According to Katzenbach and Smith (1994)\textsuperscript{47} goals are ideas. A goal is a desired and valued circumstance toward which people are working. Team goals are about the future and must be desired by the team for providing momentum and direction. Desired team goals become the foundation of the team's vision thus motivating the team while providing a common purpose and direction. Team goals literally contribute to shared vision and this vision places focus on team activities.

It is important that personal goals of the individual match the organisation goals which the members accept and to which they are committed. More collectivist individuals tend to define themselves as part of a team, give team goals priority over personal goals, and emphasize relationships with team members even at personal cost, whereas less collectivist individuals tend to define themselves as autonomous from teams, give their own self interest priority over team goals, and focus only on those relationships that are beneficial to them (Singelis et al. 1995)\textsuperscript{48}. According to Locke and Latham (1990)\textsuperscript{49}, goals affect individual performance through four mechanisms. First, goals direct action and effort toward goal-related activities and away from unrelated activities. Second, goals energize employees. Challenging goals lead to higher employee effort than easy goals. Third, goals affect persistence.
Employees exert more effort to achieve high goals. Fourth, goals motivate employees to use their existing knowledge to attain a goal or to acquire the knowledge needed to do so. (Anonymous, 2010)\(^{50}\)

Managers need to help their people define their personal goals. They can then help them interpret the relationship between their personal goals and the organization's goals. This obviously assumes the organization has clearly defined and written goals. People who see a direct correlation between their personal goals and the contribution they can make to the accomplishment of the organization's goals have a vested interest in helping the organization reach its goals. (Rohlander, 2009)\(^{51}\)

The other significant factor of team work success is that all the team efforts are directed towards the same clear goals, the team goals. It is imperative that each team understands and accepts the team goal clearly. It appears that successful virtual teams are the ones that engage in extensive and predictable communication patterns, display high task goal clarity, superior time management skills, and alertness to deadlines' (Jarvenpaa et al. 1998\(^{52}\); Jarvenpaa and Leidner 1998\(^{53}\)). Goal clarity has a long tradition as a study variable in relation to team performance (Latham & Yukl, 1975\(^{54}\); Locke, 1968\(^{55}\)). In 2006, Doolen, T.L.; Hacker, M.E.; Van Aken, E.M.,\(^{56}\) conducted research within one business unit of a Fortune 50 high-technology company. Twenty-one intact production work teams were the focus of their study. Using path analysis, they found that management processes associated with establishing a clear team purpose that is aligned with organizational goals and the allocation of critical resources were both positively related to team member satisfaction.
2.4.3 TEAM COHESION AND TRUST

COHESION

Cohesion, or the commitment of team members to the team’s overall task or to each other (Goodman, Ravlin, & Schminke, 1987)\(^5\) has been one of the more thoroughly researched emergent states (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006)\(^6\). For instance, Bass, Avolio, Jung, and Berson (2003)\(^7\) found support for cohesion as a mediator of the transformational leadership–performance relationship. Michalisin, Karau, and Tangpong (2004)\(^8\) found a positive relationship between cohesion and overall returns within their simulation study. Beal et al. (2003)\(^9\) examined studies conducted between 1951 and 2002 and found that cohesion had a mean corrected correlation with performance behaviors and performance outcomes of .30 and .17, respectively. Furthermore, Beal and colleagues illustrated that three dimensions of cohesion (Mathieu et al. / Team Effectiveness 1997-2007)\(^10\) (interpersonal, task, and group pride) were each significantly related to team performance and that “as team workflow increased, the cohesion-performance relationship became stronger.” The above factors enhance the quality of a team and make it an effective team. Cohesiveness requires well-oiled mechanisms to resolve conflicts, because differences of opinion and direction will continually arise. (Sarah Cook, Steve Macaulay, July 2007)\(^11\)

An important dimension of cohesion is handling conflict. Any team will have differences of perspective, interests or opinion that can cause conflict, but how this is handled will vary considerably. Some teams will try to ignore conflict and bury it while others will relish sparring, and team meetings will often become a gladiatorial ring in such circumstances. Conflict in general forces members to address some of their assumptions and override their striving for premature unanimity, thus leading to better performance. Teams engaged in task-oriented conflict direct their actions toward their work; the conflict forces them to be concerned with task functions and related issues.
By contrast, people-oriented conflict, though it affects the team's very survival and development, is by definition more inward-looking, and thus offers less of a direct payoff in performance. During such conflict, actions are directed toward members' relations with each other, rather than the team's agenda. (Valerie I. Sessa, 2008)\textsuperscript{64}

However, when Walter J. Wheatley, The University of West Florida, Terry R. Armstrong, The University of West Florida and E. Nick Maddox, Stetson University 1989\textsuperscript{65} studied The Impact of Leader and Team Member Characteristics upon Simulation Performance: A Start-Up Study.

It was somewhat of a surprise to these researchers to find that team cohesiveness did not play a stronger role in their study.

TRUST

Only when the individual develops trust on his fellow team members, he will seek support from them and extend his support to the team members. (Kirkman, Rosen, Tesluk, and Gibson, 2006)\textsuperscript{66} found trust served as a positive moderator of a team training proficiency–performance relationship. (Simons and Peterson, 2000)\textsuperscript{67} found that intra group trust moderated the relationship between task and relationship conflict. However, in (Dirks'1999)\textsuperscript{68} study the relation between trust and team performance was not significant. Instead of affecting performance directly, trust may create a fair relationship between group processes and performance.

Ferda Erdem, Janset Ozen, Nuray Atsan, 2003\textsuperscript{69}, on studying, the relationship between trust and team performance, investigated the relationship between the level of trust between members of a work team and the performance of that team. The study involved 148 members of 28 teams across four organizations. Suggests that though there is a relationship between trust and performance (which was found to be particularly strong within two of the organizations), there are other factors at play.
2.4.4 SEEKING SUPPORT FROM OTHER TEAM MEMBERS (INTERDEPENDENCE)

Some researchers, focusing on teams as a whole, refer in their definition of task interdependence to the division of labor within groups or departments (Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne, 1993; Thompson, 1967; Van de Ven, Delbecq, & Koenig, 1976). Others define task interdependence at the individual level as the work flowing from one team member to another in such a way that the task performance of the receiving team member depends on the task performance of the sending team member (Kiggundu, 1981, 1983).

Interdependence can be goal-related interdependence or task-related interdependence. Team members that show a level of dependence upon other members (i.e., requiring the support of others) will contribute to the degree of interdependence within a team. In turn, interdependence contributes to team trust, loyalty and cohesiveness. As well, individuals that seek information contribute to team effectiveness (Ortiz de Guinea et al., 2005). In each step of the process, it is critical for team members to be interdependent (Gaskill, 1992). These interdependent acts among group members are often categorized into either expressive (interpersonal) or instrumental (work) interactions (Guzzo and Shea 1992). Expressive interactions are affective or socio-emotional, such as showing hostility or friendliness, being dependent or asking for support. Instrumental interactions are task-related, including seeking information and making suggestions.

“Leadership in teams is relatively more important in achieving efficacious team performance outcomes when task interdependencies are higher. Therefore, as the dependencies between team members increase, so too apparently does the importance of leadership in orchestrating the adaptive coordination required to achieve effective team outcomes.” (C. Shawn Burke, 2006)
2.4.5 Team Norms

“Norms are standards shared by members of a group, and they have certain characteristics that are important to group members” (Ivancevich & Matteson, 2002)\textsuperscript{78}. When a team is created, guidelines are established for members to develop a common understanding about accepted behaviour. According to Tuckman, group norms are established during the norming stage whilst Gersick’s model suggests that norms are developed in the initial stage of group formation known as inertia. Establishing team norms (Warkentin and Beranek, 1999)\textsuperscript{79} and clear team structure also contribute toward team effectiveness (Powell et al, 2004)\textsuperscript{80}. Cohen et al. (1996)\textsuperscript{81} found that norm crystallization was positively related to effectiveness and to several group design factors considered in their study. Theoretically, behavioral norms should reduce uncertainty by helping group members predict the responses of others in situations requiring coordination. Reduced uncertainty should increase efficiency and reduce member anxiety (Argyris, 1969)\textsuperscript{82}, as groups handle similar circumstances more or less automatically, without needing to spend time and effort developing an appropriate behavioral response (Gersick & Hackman, 1990)\textsuperscript{83}. On the other hand, normative behavior can have dysfunctional consequences for organizations, if groups establish norms restricting production output (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1956\textsuperscript{84}; Trist & Bamforth, 1951\textsuperscript{85}; Whyte, 1955\textsuperscript{86}), if groups misinterpret situational cues and respond habitually to circumstances requiring novel response, or if the convenience of an available routine inhibits innovation and the search for more efficient practices (Gersick & Hackman, 1990)\textsuperscript{87}.

2.4.6 TEAM SIZE and COMPOSITION

TEAM SIZE

Zellmer-Bruhn & Gibson, (2006)\textsuperscript{88} says larger teams may have greater knowledge resources available compared with smaller teams, but they may also face additional process challenges. For large teams, the greater the diversity,
the less likely the team members were to share knowledge. It is found that the
greater the proportion of highly educated specialists on a team, the more likely
the team was to have unproductive conflicts. And finally, it is also found that
as teams became more virtual, the collaboration decreased. (L. Gratton and
T.J. Erickson, 2007)\textsuperscript{89}

Building large teams requires senior leaders to play a significant role in
ensuring effective organizational constructs and methods are in place, defining
the ways teams are formed and managed. In order to be successful with larger
teams, a team lead must have strong organizational support and constructs.
(Sarah Cook, 2009)\textsuperscript{90}

Among others, adding more people to a team heightens co-ordination needs
and does not necessarily increase the team’s productivity due to opportunities
for social loafing (Gladstein, 1984\textsuperscript{91}; Kidd, 1961\textsuperscript{92}; Latané et al, 1979\textsuperscript{93};
Paris et al, 1999\textsuperscript{94}; Steiner, 1972\textsuperscript{95}; Sundstrom et al., 1990\textsuperscript{96}). Teams should
be staffed to the smallest number needed to do the work (Hackman, 1990\textsuperscript{97};
Sundstrom et al, 1990\textsuperscript{98}). Optimal team size, for reasons of span of control, is
generally not more than seven members; however, in well-trained teams it can
be as much as twelve. Optimal team size for decision-making or problem-
solving tasks is generally no more than five or six members (Bass, 1982)\textsuperscript{99}.

Magjuka and Baldwin (1991)\textsuperscript{100} found group size to be a significant positive
predictor of group performance among employee involvement team, however
Vinokar–Kaplan (1995)\textsuperscript{101} found group size as a negative predictor of
performance among 15 interdisciplinary hospital teams.

**COMPOSITION**
The mixture of Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes (KSAs) plus other team
characteristics, Klimoski and Jones (1995)\textsuperscript{102} thought any individual
difference variables would influence team performance (e.g., Gender, race,
age) (Morgan and Lassiter, 1992)\textsuperscript{103}
DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

A meta-analysis by (Webber and Donahue, 2001)\textsuperscript{104} sought to distill the influence of demographic diversity, and found no support for a relationship with either cohesion or performance. Many of studies have found diversity in age (Kilduff et al., 2000)\textsuperscript{105} and tenure (Jehn & Bezrukova, 2004)\textsuperscript{106} to be beneficial to performance. However, race/ethnicity, gender, age, tenure, and education (e.g., Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt, 2003\textsuperscript{107}; Kirkman, Tesluk, & Rosen, 2001\textsuperscript{108}; Leonard, Levine, & Joshi, 2004\textsuperscript{109}; Li & Hambrick, 2005\textsuperscript{110}; Mohammad & Angell, 2003, 2004\textsuperscript{111}; Pelled et al., 1999\textsuperscript{112}; Simons, Pelled, & Smith, 1999\textsuperscript{113}; Timmerman, 2000\textsuperscript{114}; Townsend & Scott, 2001\textsuperscript{115}; Watson et al., 1998\textsuperscript{116}) have all been shown to be unfavorable to processes (e.g., relationship conflict), developing states (e.g., empowerment; organizational commitment), and performance. However, when time is considered as one factor, the results vary. (Jackson and Joshi, 2004)\textsuperscript{117} found evidence of a three-way diversity interaction, with sales team performance being lowest for teams with a combination of relatively high tenure, gender, and ethnic diversities.

COGNITIVE FACTORS

When people use their strengths in full, the diversity of skills and personalities can compensate for each other's weaknesses. Heterogeneity in functional expertise and educational background have been found to positively relate to team effectiveness as this form of diversity provides teams with access to a variety of expertise, information bases, and resources that may not be available if all members were from the same functional area (Horwitz, 2005)\textsuperscript{118}. Although diversity in functional expertise has shown to be beneficial, it may also be responsible for increased conflict, complicate internal communication, and hamper coordination within teams (Jenh & Bezrukova; cited in Horwitz, 2005)\textsuperscript{119}. Team effectiveness depends in part on bringing together people who have different skills that somehow complement each other. This can mean
different technical abilities or communication skills. Because of the unique demands of working in a team, the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) needed for effective performance differ from those needed by individuals working alone (Morgeson, Reider, & Campion, 2005)\(^{120}\). (Adair, 1986)\(^{121}\) states that a team is a group in which the individuals share a common aim and in which the jobs and skills of each member fit in with those of the others.

Differences in educational backgrounds have been associated with increased conflict and discomfort among team members (Horwitz, 2005)\(^{122}\).

Hye-Ryun Kang (2005)\(^{123}\), Ewha Womans University; Korea, investigated the importance of team member characteristics, particularly cognitive and demographic, on team effectiveness. His analysis showed that team

Clear team structure also contributes toward team effectiveness (Powell et al., 2004)\(^{124}\). Although not considered extensively, the way in which teams are structured can be important as it “serves as a bridge between organization-level strategy decisions and staffing decisions” (Hollenbeck et al., 2002)\(^{125}\). Moon et al. (2004)\(^{126}\) assessed how changing team structures influences performance. Their findings suggested that teams were likely to perform better when transitioning from a functional to divisional structure rather than the reverse.

A team needs an environment to function effectively. Organizational context and leadership style are the factors that can provide favorable environment to the team.

2.4.7 TEAM LEADERSHIP

Team leadership is an important ingredient in realizing team affective (Foels, Driskell, Mullen, & Salas, 2000)\(^{127}\) and behavior-based outcomes (Burke et al., 2006)\(^{128}\). The actions of an external team leader can make or break their success (Druskat & Kayes, 2000)\(^{129}\). However, Hambley, O’Neill, and Kline (2007)\(^{130}\) investigated the role of leadership style (i.e., transformational,
transactional) and failed to find any significant relationships with both style and the quality of team interactions. Katzenbach and Smith (2001)\(^{131}\) describe two leadership styles, single-leader discipline and team-leader discipline. Single-leader discipline is where the team is led by an individual team member and that member either makes the decisions or facilitates the team to make decisions. Team-leader discipline is where an entire team makes decisions collectively. Leadership behaviors – both task and person-focused—do matter in team outcomes, though they tend to account for only a small-to-moderate portion of the variance. (C. Shawn Burke of the University of Central Florida and others - June, 2006)\(^{132}\)

Team leadership differs from traditional top-down leadership in the following ways (Bradford, 1976, as adapted by Yukl, 1989)\(^{133}\) says that,

1. Responsibility for group effectiveness is not on the leader's shoulders but is shared by the group.
2. Control over the final decision is not held by the leader but is best left to the group.
3. The importance of one's position and power are de-emphasized in team leadership.
4. The leader perceives the group not as a set of individuals but as an "interacting and collective team."
5. The task-oriented functions of the team are not performed only by the leader but are shared by the entire group through its new roles.
6. Group maintenance functions are not performed systematically but are emphasized and shared by the group as a whole.
7. Socio emotional processes and interactions, while mostly ignored by leaders in top-down settings, are observed closely by team leaders.
8. Expressions of members' needs and feelings are not discouraged but are encouraged by team leaders and are dealt with openly in meetings.
2.4.8 ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

Organizational context include, Organizational resources, reward system-(whether team output or individual output rewarded), span of control and freedom given by management, the overall support of the work team that is given by management, the ability to implement decisions made in the team. In Hackman's model, organizational context, refers to the reward system, the education system, and the information system, all of which support the work of the team. A supportive organizational context includes aligning education, information, technical, and reward systems to support teamwork; (Elaine Russo Martin, 2006)\textsuperscript{134} John Mathieu, M. Travis Maynard, Tammy Rapp and Lucy Gilson (2008)\textsuperscript{135} University of Connecticut, Storrs define organizational contextual variables as sources of influence that are external to the team, yet emanate from the larger organizational system within which they are nested.

In 2003, Doolen, T.L.; Hacker, M.E.; Van Aken, E.M.,\textsuperscript{136} conducted research within one business unit of a Fortune 50 high-technology company. Twenty-one intact production work teams were the focus of their study. They found Organizational systems that provide teams with the necessary training were found to have a significant and positive linear relationship with team member satisfaction. In their study they also found that the Organizational systems that provide teams with the necessary information to have a significant and positive linear relationship with both team leader ratings of effectiveness and team member satisfaction.

Recognition is like anything else, it requires time, attention, and a consistent approach. Management must have a process in place so that managers and supervisors are actively looking at employees to identify those opportunities to recognize and reward good performance. A highly valued set of rewards is worth little without a consistent way to track and recognize superior employee performance. Poor or untimely communication devalues rewards and
recognition, because other employees have not been informed or is not sure what was actually done to earn the reward. (Anonymous 2008)\textsuperscript{137}

2.4.9 WORK DESIGN

Dr. T.S. Vembu (2003)\textsuperscript{138} Motivated and empowered team can go a long way in achieving the purpose of the department in particular and goals of the organisation in general.

Wageman (2001)\textsuperscript{139} found that teams working in empowered designs were better able to self-manage and exhibited higher performance levels than those working in more traditional designs. Moreover, she found that the teams’ self-managing behaviors mediated the relationships between design features and team effectiveness. The design of team activities affects members’ capabilities of working together (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992)\textsuperscript{140}. Work designs that have allocated tasks such as determining workflow, performance strategies, and internal functioning from external managers to team members (i.e., implemented structural empowerment designs) should enhance members’ feelings of team empowerment. (Mathieu, Gilson, and Ruddy, 2006)\textsuperscript{141}

2.4.10 JOB SATISFACTION

Johns (1996)\textsuperscript{142}, defines job as a collection of attitudes that workers have about their jobs.

Justin A. Irving (2005)\textsuperscript{143}, found job satisfaction to be significantly and substantially related to team effectiveness as well as providing a moderating influence on the relationship between servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams.

However, Laura Newmark, Jerry W. Koehler, Thomas W. Philippe, (2008)\textsuperscript{144} found people who did not work in a team had significantly higher job satisfaction than team members. It indicates that working on teams may not
have a positive effect on team member job satisfaction. This was a significant finding since job satisfaction has long been a significant variable for determining organizational effectiveness. Since many organizations are moving to team based organizations, the data indicates that this movement may cause organizations to experience significant problems in implementing teams, particularly in the area of job satisfaction.

Picture of the Tarragona Spain ©2003 by James Martin depicts team work.
Source: http://goeurope.about.com/library/phot/
A statue in the center of the Ramblas Nova, commemorating the castellers or human pyramid builders, emphasizes the importance of team work.

None of us is as smart as all of us.
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