

CHAPTER-VI

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

If you do not know where you are going, every road will get you nowhere

-Henry Kissinger (former Secretary of State, USA)

6.0 Introduction

Of the important interdependent elements of research, we have already dealt with three: an overview of the significance of the teambuilding was presented in the first chapter; the relevant theories about the phenomenon and objectives of the study were covered in the second chapter. Review of literature was covered in the third chapter, and the fourth chapter described the method of data collection, besides other related aspects of the research design including the statistical treatment of the data. The present chapter deals with the next element, namely, analysing of the results obtained and drawing of conclusions from these results. This chapter discusses the results of the various statistical analyses that were carried out and uses the results to test the hypotheses that were set forth in the second chapter.

6.1 An Overview on Distribution of Scores

The basic data collected on team building consists of 23808 terms (256 X 93). One simple way to make sense out of such a large mass of raw data is to apply the science of descriptive statistics to it. Although an absolute frequency analysis of the distribution is considered suitable for a preliminary summarisation of raw data⁷⁸, therefore relative frequency (percentage) analysis was resorted to, so as to be able to compare, readily and with ease, the two given samples of unequal size. The following subsections discuss the relative frequencies, with respect to their scores on each of the variables.

6.2 Managerial/Sector wise Profile

A detailed study of the sample shows that the largest sample size in sector wise distribution was private sector followed by the armed forces and the public sector. On the other hand when the analysis is carried out based on the managerial level distribution, it emerges that when chi-square test was carried out for testing the managerial and sector wise distribution of sample, the results obtained are indicated in Table 6.1. There did not appear to be any significant difference within the groups as the significance level of .685 and .542 were both above the 0.5.

Table 6.1: Chi-square Test Statistics for checking sample distribution.

	SECTOR WISE	MGR LEVEL
Chi-Square	.758	1.227
df	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.685	.542
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 85.3		

⁷⁸ Klecka, W.R. "Discriminant Analysis" in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1975.

6.2 Interpretation of Data

In the interpretation of data calculated mean has been utilised as the interpretation tool for checking the validity of the statements. The statements have been rejected if the mean works out to be below 2.5. The statements have not been accepted if the mean is between 2.5 to 3.5 and have been accepted if the mean is above 3.5. In case of difficulty in interpretation using the mean the next tool would be the median and in case of further difficulty, mode has been utilised. In the subsequent paragraphs acceptance or non-acceptance of the statement has been analysed. A summary of the status of statements based on measure of central tendency is placed as Appendix K.

6.2.4.1 Types of Teams Existing in the Modern Indian Organisations

As can be seen in Table 6. 2, it has been accepted that formal teams do exist in the organisations. However no clearcut acceptance has emerged in questions relating to organisational support to informal teaming up and their effectiveness in the organisation.

Table 6.2: Response analysis Section I A

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
A1. Formal teams existing within the organisation	3.961	4.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
A2. Informal teaming up encouraged in the organisation	3.242	4.000	4.0	Statement not Accepted
A3. Informal teams are more effective than formal teams	3.320	4.000	4.0	Statement not Accepted

6.2.4.2 Various Stages of Team Building in Indian Organisations and their Effect in Development of Teams.

Other than rejecting the fact that initial teaming up is appreciated by the new team members, all other statements have been accepted by the respondents. The basis for this is shown in Table. 6.3

Table 6.3: Response analysis Section I B

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
B1. Formal team building (group cohesion) sessions have been held in the organisation.	4.160	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
B2. Initial team forming up is appreciated by the new team members	2.180	2.000	2.0	Statement Rejected
B3. Whenever new team meets, there is problem in the formative stages	4.027	4.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
B4. Relations normalise after starting phase or once the teething problems are sorted out	4.441	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
B5. After the team settles down, does the organisations output increase vis-à-vis the initial output	3.965	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted

6.2.4.3 Characteristics and Limitations which affect the optimum team performance in the Indian Organisations.

On the basis of mean the only statements which have been accepted by the respondents are: acceptance of tasks/objectives being understood well by the group,

team performing as a cohesive group and conflict in the group being resolved amicable. Others have either not been accepted or have been rejected.

Table 6.4: Response analysis Section I C

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
C1. Team cohesion is the reason for the team to perform optimally	3.086	3.000	4.0	Statement not Accepted
C2. External factors inhibit the performance of existing teams	3.074	3.000	5.0	Statement not Accepted
C3. Team sessions can be convened easily and frequently	2.676	3.000	1.0	Statement not Accepted
C4. The tasks/objectives of the group are well understood and accepted by the group	3.754	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
C5. Team performs as a cohesive group	3.992	4.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
C6. There is friction within the group	1.711	1.000	1.0	Statement Rejected
C7. Whenever there is difference in opinion, it is resolved amicably	4.188	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
C8. Team performance isn't better than individual performance	2.676	3.000	1.0	Statement not Accepted
C9. Individual view points restrict the progress of the team	1.750	1.000	1.0	Statement Rejected

6.2.4.4 Role of leadership in team building

Based on the analysis of subsection D as seen from Table 7.5, it emerges that leadership does make a positive impact on the teams output, but on the other hand it also emerges that in the existing scenario, team leadership is imposed on the team in which the team members do not have any say. Another aspect which emerges is the perception that a horizontal hierarchy in the team would improve the teams output.

Table 6.5: Response analysis Section I D

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
D1. Team leadership make a positive impact on the team output	4.168	4.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
D2. Team leadership an issue	2.613	2.000	1.0	Statement not Accepted
D3. Team leadership imposed onto the team	3.953	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
D4. If choice of team leadership is given, it improve the team's output	4.340	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
D5. A horizontal team hierarchy show a positive effect on the teams output	2.480	2.000	2.0	Statement Rejected

6.2.4.5 Reasons for failure of teams in Indian organisations

As can be seen in Table. 7.6, no statement has been accepted in this group. Implications for the industry are heartening because rejection of statement E1, E2, E3 and E5 mean that the team is not threatened by minor differences and failures. Also here in rejection of E5 means it is rarely the individuals who are responsible for the failure of teams and more often than not it is the other factors which lead to its failure.

Table 6.6: Response analysis Section I E

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
E1. Dissent/disagreement in the team cause problems within the team	1.867	2.000	1.0	Statement Rejected
E2. Dissent in the team cause the team to falter	1.551	1.000	1.0	Statement Rejected
E3. The team experience failure often	1.527	1.000	1.0	Statement Rejected
E4. Do you share the sense that 'only the team can fail'?	2.582	2.000	2.0	Statement not Accepted
E5. Team failure is generally attributed to a few individuals	1.707	1.000	1.0	Statement Rejected
E6. Failure in team causes the team to break up	2.008	2.000	2.0	Statement Rejected

6.2.4.6 Use of an External Consultant to achieve Optimum Performance?

No statement has been accepted in this sub-section. On further study it appears that of the six statements, three medians and modes indicate acceptance of the statements. On further study it emerges that while the public and private sector make extensive use of external intervention the armed forces do not resort to intervention through external consultants. More details can be seen in Appendix L.

Table 6.7: Response analysis Section I F

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
F1. The organisation has organised team intervention sessions	3.352	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
F2. The failure in the team has resulted in an external intervention consultant's involvement	3.211	4.000	4.0	Statement not Accepted
F3. External intervention is appreciated within the team	2.426	2.000	2.0	Statement Rejected
F4. In case of problems within the team, external intervention is sought	3.129	3.000	3.0	Statement not Accepted
F5. External intervention is always helpful in improving the team's effectiveness	3.277	4.000	4.0	Statement not accepted

6.2.4.7 Various methods of team compensation in India

Based on the analysis of subsection G it emerges that in the existing scenario, team compensation is not divided equally among the team members. Respondents have favoured incentives being divided equally among the team members and have also recommended that team compensation should be complemented over and above individual compensation.

Table 6.8: Response analysis Section I G

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
G1. Team compensation is divided equally among all team members	1.844	2.000	2.0	Statement Rejected
G2. Team incentives should be divided equally among all members	4.438	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
G3. Team compensation should always be complemented over and above individual compensation	4.684	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted

6.2.4.8 Effect of team appraisal on teams in India

In this subsection, the importance of appraisal in teams has emerged as an important factor. While it has been accepted that team appraisal should be a part of an

individual's appraisal, however it has also emerged that team appraisal is not better than individual appraisal per se. Another observation which has emerged is that an individual who is a star performer as an individual will always not be a good team player.

Table 6.9: Response analysis Section I H

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
H1. Team player behaviour is an important factor in assessing employee performance	4.258	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
H2. Team appraisal is better than individual appraisal	2.754	2.000	2.0	Statement not Accepted
H3. Individual appraisal should continue along with team appraisal	4.039	4.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
H4. Team appraisal should be a part of each individual's appraisal	4.594	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
H5. An individual star performer would invariably be a good team player	3.105	3.000	4.0	Statement Rejected

6.2.4.9 Resistance to the formation of a team in Indian organisations and ways to overcome these

On detailed analysis it emerges that while resistance within a does exist, it takes some effort to overcome this resistance. In spite of this a team is able to take most decisions by consensus and with extensive participation by team members.

Table 6.10: Response analysis Section I I

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
I1. Resistance within a team invariably exists	3.297	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
I2. Resistance within the team can be overcome easily	2.473	2.000	2.0	Statement Rejected
I3. Seeking consensus in a team is easy	2.164	2.000	2.0	Statement Rejected
I4. Disagreement on a point is sorted out without major conflict	4.273	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
I5. Most decisions are reached by consensus and formal voting is kept to a minimum.	3.746	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
I6. Participation by team members is extensive	4.277	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted

6.2.4.10 Creating productive teams

With regards to creating productive teams, all the statements in this subsection have been accepted. Respondents have agreed that teams become productive once they become a cohesive group. Team leadership has also emerged as an important factor in producing productive teams. While productive teams can be created within existing teams, its productivity invariably depends on the quality of its members.

Table 6.11: Response analysis Section I J

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
J1. Teams become productive once they are cohesive	4.633	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
J2. Productive team is the one which has good leaders	3.891	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
J3. The productivity of a team invariably depends on the quality of its members	4.668	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
J4. Productive teams can be created within the existing teams	3.957	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted

6.2.4.11 Team training

It has emerged that while the productivity improves with training, team training is a weak area within the organisation. On the basis of mean only one statement has been accepted by the respondents. On further study it emerges that on the basis of median two statements have been accepted and on the basis of mode three statements have been accepted. On detailed analysis it emerges that while the private sector and public sector does give adequate stress to training needs the armed forces have different criteria for training and there is no out sourcing of training requirement by the armed forces.

Table 6.12: Response analysis Section I K

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
K1. Team training capsules/workshops are conducted regularly within organisation	3.207	4.000	4.0	Statement not Accepted
K2. Team training improves productivity of the team	3.703	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
K3. A Formal team training calendar exists for the organisation	2.727	2.000	2.0	Statement not Accepted
K4. Team training requirements are outsourced	2.863	3.000	4.0	Statement not Accepted

6.2.4.12 Team structure

Based on the analysis of the data in sub section L, it emerges that team structure is an important aspect in the existing organisations. The existing teams have all required specialisations, the team structures are laid down formally by the organisation and team members consider themselves to be a part of the team. It also emerges that the weakest link is not the main reason for its failure.

Table 6.13: Response analysis Section I L

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
L1. The team structure is laid down formally in the organisation	3.895	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
L2. Team has members from all required specialisations	4.160	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
L3. Team members often change frequently	2.281	2.000	1.0	Statement Rejected
L4. The weakest link in the team is the cause of its failure	2.816	3.000	2.0	Statement not accepted
L5. The team members feel themselves to be a part of the team	4.270	5.000	5.0	Statement accepted

6.2.4.13 Creation of a team

With regards to the creation of teams, the most important aspect which emerges is that good leadership helps in facing challenging tasks which the team faces. Another fact which emerges is that difficulties do not lead to conflicts within the team.

Table 6.14: Response analysis Section I M

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
M1. Challenges bring out better performance within the team	1.539	1.000	1.0	Statement Rejected
M2. Difficulties lead to conflict within the team	2.574	2.000	1.0	Statement not Accepted
M3. The motivation within the team increases whenever the challenging task is assigned to it	3.238	4.000	4.0	Statement not accepted
M4. Good leadership helps the team in facing challenging tasks	4.602	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted

6.2.4.14 Team opportunities

While it emerges that teams now can be found in all parts of the organisations, good performance does not spur growth of teams in other parts of the organisation and also the fact that teaming up opportunities are not exploited by the organisation.

Table 6.15: Response analysis Section I N

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
N1. Teams can be found in all departments/sections of the organisation	4.023	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
N2. Cross-functional teams exist within the organisation	3.480	4.000	4.0	Statement not accepted
N3. Good team performance in one department spurs growth of teams within the other departments	3.023	3.000	4.0	Statement not Accepted
N4. Teaming-up opportunities are exploited by the organisation	2.715	2.000	2.0	Statement not Accepted

6.2.4.15 Teams at the top

This sub section emerges to be one of the most important aspects of the study. It has emerged that teaming up at the top echelons of the organisation is most difficult and the top level management prefers individual over group decision.

Table 6.16: Response analysis Section I O

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
O1. The team effort at the highest levels in the organisation is difficult	4.305	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
O2. Top hierarchy of the organisation prefers individual decisions vis-à-vis group decision	4.574	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
O3. There is difficulty in teambuilding efforts at highest levels of the organisation	4.688	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
O4. Top-level management promotes team decisions	4.098	4.000	5.0	Statement Accepted

6.2.4.16 Team accountability

On detailed analysis it emerges that individuals still are given more importance over teams even in team functioning. Whether it is the failure of the team or its outstanding performance, it is always the individual who is held responsible for it and is held accountable for it.

Table 6.17: Response analysis Section I P

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
P1. In case of a failure, the entire team is held responsible	2.375	2.000	2.0	Statement Rejected
P2. The team is accountable to the top management for its actions	2.723	2.000	2.0	Statement not Accepted
P3. In case of outstanding performance the leader is appreciated more than the team members	4.020	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
P4. It is easier to hold an individual accountable rather than the entire team	4.629	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted

6.2.4.17 Promotion of teams

This sub section reinforces the fact that higher performance standards promote better teamwork and a team tends to achieve higher standards whenever team cohesion is better.

Table 6.18: Response analysis Section I Q

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
Q1. Higher performance standards promote better teamwork	4.078	4.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
Q2. The team tends to achieve high standards whenever team cohesion is better	4.551	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted

6.2.4.18 Hierarchy and teams

With regards to hierarchy in teams, it emerges that inspite of teams proving themselves in today's organisations; hierarchy is still given a lot of stress in the organisation and even in the team. Another aspect which is of concern is that star performers do not get to lead the team which is still hierarchy based.

Table 6.19: Response analysis Section I R

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Result
R1. The organisation has strong hierarchy system	4.441	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
R2. Hierarchy is given a lot of stress within the team	4.043	4.000	4.0	Statement Accepted
R3. Decision-making within the team is hierarchy based	3.719	4.000	4.0	Statement not Accepted
R4. Team leadership is hierarchy based	4.672	5.000	5.0	Statement Accepted
R5. Star performers within the team generally get leadership of the team	1.996	2.000	1.0	Statement Rejected

6.3 Testing of Hypotheses

Nine research hypotheses were framed which were to be tested during the research. These were all based on team work and teambuilding in Indian organisations. While these were to be tested based on the answer received through the questionnaire, these were to be substantiated based on the interviews and replies to the open ended question (Q.II-B) While initial analysis could be done by the data analysis carried out in Para 6.7, hypothesis testing tool which was utilised was Chi-Square test utilising the managerial classification as the base. A summary of the test results is placed as Appendix F for the hypotheses and as Appendix J for data in Section II A.

Hypothesis –I : Challenges do not bring out better performance within the team. (M-1)

Out of 256 respondents, 218 respondents (85.2%) rejected this statement. The mean of 1.539 also indicates that the statement is in the regime of Disagree. The ANOVA test gives us a significance level of .001 for sector wise distribution between the groups and .005 for managerial levels between various groups, thereby indicating a significant difference in both the sector wise distribution and managerial group distribution. When Chi-Square test is carried out the following values are obtained, Chi Square value: 19.638, df: 8 and sig value: 0.012. Since the sig value is less than the Alpha value of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis –II : Team performance isn't better than individual performance. (C-8)

Out of 256 respondents, 82(32%) accepted the statement, 51(19.9) were unsure, 123(48%) rejected the statement. The mean of 2.676 indicates undecided regime. The ANOVA test gives us a significance level of .152 for sector wise distribution between the groups and .702 for managerial levels between various groups, thereby indicating no significant difference in either sector wise distribution or in the managerial group distribution. When Chi-Square test is carried out the following values are obtained, Chi Square value: 17.137, df: 8 and sig value: 0.029. Since the sig value is less than the Alpha value of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted

Hypothesis–III: Teaming-up opportunities are exploited by the organisation. (N-4)

Out of 256 respondents, 94 (36.8%) accepted the statement, 24(9.4%) were unsure, 138 (53.9%) rejected the statement. The mean of 2.715 indicates Uvsure regime. The ANOVA test gives us a significance level of .116 for sector wise distribution between the groups and .150 for managerial levels between various groups, thereby indicating no significant difference in either sector wise distribution or in the managerial group distribution. When Chi-Square test is carried out the following values are obtained, Chi Square value: 14837, df: 8 and sig value: 0.062. Since the sig value is more than the Alpha value of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis –IV : In case of outstanding performance the leader is appreciated more than the team members. (P-3)

Out of 256 respondents, 203 (79.3%) accepted the statement, 14(5.5%) were unsure and 39 (15.3%) rejected the statement. A mean works of 4.020 indicates Acceptance of the statement. The ANOVA test gives us a significance level of .000 for sector wise distribution between the groups and .738 for managerial levels between various groups, thereby indicating a significant difference in sector wise distribution but no significant difference in the managerial group distribution. When Chi-Square test is carried out the following values are obtained, Chi Square value: 5.494, df: 8 and sig value: 0.704. Since the sig value is more than the Alpha value of 0.05, the null hypothesis could not be rejected

Hypothesis –V: The team effort at the highest levels in the organisation is easy. (O-1)

Out of 256 respondents, 67 (26.2%) accepted the statement, 31(12.1%) were unsure and 158 (61.7%) rejected the statement. A mean of 2.398 also indicates that the statement is in Reject regime. The ANOVA test gives us a significance level of .000 for sector wise distribution between the groups and .000 for managerial levels between various groups, thereby indicating a significant difference in both sector wise distribution and in the managerial group distribution. When Chi-Square test is carried out the following values are obtained, Chi Square value: 23.671, df: 8 and sig value: 0.003. Since the sig value is less than the Alpha value of 0.05, the null hypothesis rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis –VI : It is easier to hold an individual accountable rather than the entire team. (P-4)

Out of 256 respondents, 251 (98.0%) accepted the statement, 3(1.2%) were unsure and 2(.8%) rejected the statement. A mean of 4.629 also indicates that statement is in the Accept regime. The ANOVA test gives us a significance level of .832 for sector wise distribution between the groups and .858 for managerial levels between various groups, thereby indicating no significant difference in either sector wise distribution or in the managerial group distribution. When Chi-Square test is carried out the following values are obtained, Chi Square value: 3.224, df: 8 and sig value: 0.780. Since the sig value is more than the Alpha value of 0.05, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Hypothesis –VII : Good team performance in one department spurs growth of teams within the other departments of the organisation.(N-3)

Out of 256 respondents, 109 (45.6%) accepted the statement, 42(16.4%) were unsure, 105 (41.0%) rejected the statement. A mean of 3.023 indicates that the statement is in the undecided regime. The ANOVA test gives us a significance level of .999 for sector wise distribution between the groups and .000 for managerial levels between various groups, thereby indicating no significant difference in sector wise distribution but a significant difference in the managerial group distribution. When Chi-Square test is carried out the following values are obtained, Chi Square value: 26.482, df: 8 and sig value: 0.001. Since the sig value is less than the Alpha value of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis –VIII : : If a choice of team leadership is given to the team, it would improve the team's output (D4)

Out of 256 respondents, 227 (88.7%) accepted the statement, 19(7.4%) were unsure, and 10 (4.0%) rejected the statement. A mean of 4.340 indicates that the statement is in Accept regime. The ANOVA test gives us a significance level of .620 for sector wise distribution between the groups and 0.004 for managerial levels between various groups, thereby indicating no significant difference in sector wise distribution but a significant difference in the managerial group distribution. When Chi-Square test is carried out the following values are obtained, Chi Square value:

21.685, df: 8 and sig value: 0.006. Since the sig value is less than the Alpha value of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis -IX : Team sessions can be convened easily and frequently (C-3)

Out of 256 respondents, 81 (31.6%) accepted the statement, 53(20.7%) were unsure and 122 (47.6%) rejected the statement. A mean of 2.676 indicates that the statement is in the undecided regime. The ANOVA test gives us a significance level of .460 for sector wise distribution between the groups and 0.010 for managerial levels between various groups, thereby indicating no significant difference in sector wise distribution and a significant difference in the managerial group distribution. When Chi-Square test is carried out the following values are obtained, Chi Square value: 21.356, df: 8 and sig value: 0.006. Since the sig value is less than the Alpha value of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted.