

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH RESULTS

Data from the survey are analysed and discussed in this chapter. The four areas of interest include a general description of the respondents' demographic characteristics, an analysis of the 'Team Performance Rating', an examination on effectiveness of the 'Team Dynamics' programme and analysis of the 'Group Effectiveness' and 'Interpersonal Process'. Before concluding, a general comments on the 'reliability' of the questions and constructs will be given.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

A total of 133 questionnaires were distributed in the 4 Departments of the Transmission Division. This yield a return of 89 copies (66.9%) of which 84 copies (63.2%) were usable for the purpose of this study.

TABLE 2

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC OF THE RESPONDENTS

Demographic Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<u>Duration of Service with TNB</u>		
Less than 5 years	11	13.1
5 to 10 years	25	29.8
11 to 15 years	24	28.6
16 to 20 years	8	9.5

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100

More than 20 years	16	19.0
Total	84	100.0
Age		
Less than 25 years	4	4.8
26 to 30 years	19	22.6
31 to 35 years	24	28.6
36 to 40 years	11	13.1
More than 41 years	26	31.0
Total	84	100.0
Race		
Malay	64	76.2
Chinese	14	16.7
Indian	5	6.0
Others	1	1.2
Total	84	100.0
Sex		
Male	72	85.7
Female	12	14.3
Total	84	100.0
Marital Status		
Married	79	94.0
Single	5	6.0
Total	84	100.0

Monthly Salary

Less than RM1000	2	2.4
RM1001 to RM2000	10	11.9
RM2001 to RM3000	10	11.9
RM3001 to RM4000	23	27.4
RM4001 to RM5000	10	11.9
More than RM5000	29	34.5
Total	84	100.0

Present Designation

Junior Executive	7	8.3
Executive	13	15.5
Senior Executive	31	36.9
Manager	15	17.9
Senior Manager	10	11.9
AGM & above	8	9.5
Total	84	100.0

Present Unit/Department

Transmission Mtce (HQ)	2	2.4
Transmission Mtce (North)	12	14.3
Transmission Mtce (South)	10	11.9
Transmission Mtce (Tech. Dev.)	7	8.3
Transmission Project (HQ)	6	7.1
Transmission Mtce (North)	7	8.3
Transmission Mtce (South)	7	8.3

Transmission Mtce (500KV)	3	3.6
Transmission Operation (HQ)	3	3.6
Transmission Mtce (System Planning)	6	7.1
Transmission Mtce (Telecontrol)	3	3.6
Transmission Mtce (Control)	14	16.7
Business Management Unit	4	4.8
Total	84	100.0

Table 2 summarises the demographic characteristics of the 84 respondents. In term of duration of service with Tenaga, 11 respondents (13.1%) had served 5 years and less. They were mostly new recruitment and served as Executive. There were 25 (29.8%) Senior Executives who have been in service for between 5 to 10 years. Majority of the 24 (28.6%) executives in the 11 to 15 years bracket were Managers, normally in charge of a small headquarters or regional units. These two later groups made up nearly 60% of the executives in Transmission Division and this is reflective of percentage of population of executive in the Division. Eight (9.5%) of the respondents had served between 16 to 20 years and the rest comprising of 16 (19.0%) executives had served for more than 20 years. Most of the executives in these 2 groups were Senior Managers and Assistant General Managers and above, and most of them were heads of Units or Departments.

In term of age, four (4.8%) of the respondents were less than 25 years old whereas 19 (22.6%) of the them were in the 26 to 30 years age group while 24 (28.6%) in the 30 to 35 years bracket. These two groups formed the majority of the

executives in the Division. The two last groups consisting of 11 (13.1%) and 26 (31.0%) executives from the 36 to 40 years and more than 40 years category respectively, formed about 44% of the total respondents. Executives in this groups were mainly Senior Managers and Assistant General Mnager (AGM) and above. Generally, there seems to be correlation between age groups and the duration of service mentioned earlier in this chapter.

Later in the chapter, respondents are divided into 3 age groups for analysis. These are the 26 to 30 years group(19 respondents-22.6%), the 31 to 35 years group(24 respondents-28.6%) and the 35 years and above group (37respondents-44.1%).

The sample comprised of 64 Malays (76.2%), 14 Chinese (16.7%) , 5 Indians (6.0%) and 1 others (1.2%). This is the true profile of racial composition in Tenaga, which was formerly a Government agency and therefore employment policy is consistent with the national policy.

About 86% of the respondents were males as compared to 16% females. This can be attributed to most of the executives in Transmission Division are engineers and engineering is not popular among the female gender. However, there are a few female engineers in the Division.

The survey results also indicate that 79 (94.%) of the respondents were married as compared to 5 (6%) of them still single. By looking at the age profile, the percentages of married and single are as expected.

Tenaga paid its executives quite well. This can be seen from monthly salary profile. Only 2 (2.4%) executives took home less than RM 1000.00 a month. Ten (11.9%) of them earned between RM 1001 to RM 2000. These two groups are made up of junior executives and newly appointed executives. Another 10 (11.9%) were paid between RM 2001 and RM 3000 and most of the executives in this group were Senior Executives. Twenty four (23%) of the executives earned a monthly income of between RM 3001 and RM 4000 and 10 (11.9%) bagged in between RM 4001 and RM 5000. Most of the executives in these 2 later groups were Managers and a few of them were Senior Managers. The rest of the respondents, 29 (34.5%) of the respondents earned more than RM 5000.00 a month. These executives were mostly Senior Managers and above.

The survey results also indicate that the majority of the executives were senior executives (31 or 36.9% of the respondents). Executives (13 or 15.5% of the respondents) and Manager (15 or 17.9% of the respondents) made up the next biggest groups in the Division. The three groups represented more than 70% of the executive population. Therefore, their opinions and their concerns should be given due attention by top management of Tenaga.

During analysis later in the chapter, the groups were divided according to managerial level. Two levels were determined and they were the Executives level and the Managers level. The former level comprised of the Junior Executives, the Executives and the Senior Executives. The later group comprised of the Managers, the Senior Managers and the Assistant General Managers (AGMs) and above.

Breakdown by Departments (functions) indicated that 31(36.9%) of the respondents were Transmission Maintenance executives, 23 (27.5%) were Transmission Projects executives, 26 (30.9%) were from Transmission Operation while the rest of 4 (4.8%) of the executives came from the Business Management Unit (BMU). The breakdown by functions are used for analysis later in this chapter.

ANALYSIS OF TEAM PERFORMANCE RATING

Table 3 summarises the mean score and the standard deviation for all the 28 questions in the ‘Team Performance Rating’. At the bottom of the table, the questions are regrouped into 7 dimensions and are tabulated together with the mean score and standard deviation of the dimensions.

TABLE 3
TEAM PERFORMANCE RATING

NO.	QUESTIONNAIRES	MEAN	STD. DEV.
A1	Members are committed to a common purpose	3.7	0.630
A2	Collective sense of power	3.4	0.779
A3	Members express themselves openly	3.7	0.843
A4	Members perform different roles	3.8	0.713
A5	Output is high	3.5	0.768
A6	Individual contributions appreciated by leader	3.5	0.951
A7	Everyone feels good about membership	3.6	0.908

A8	Goals are clear	3.4	0.863
A9	Members have access to necessary skills	3.5	0.813
A10	Understanding acceptance is expressed	3.6	0.852
A11	Members share responsibility for team	3.7	0.896
A12	Quality is excellent	3.4	0.713
A13	Team accomplishment is recognised	3.5	0.855
A14	Individuals are confident	3.4	0.812
A15	Strategies for achieving goal	3.2	0.845
A16	Policies & practices support team	3.3	0.823
A17	Members listen attentively to each other	3.6	0.743
A18	Members are adaptable to changing demands	3.5	0.719
A19	Team decision making is effective	3.5	0.784
A20	Group members feel respected	3.5	0.843
A21	Members have a sense a pride and satisfaction in their work.	3.4	0.868
A22	Individual roles are clear	3.3	0.912
A23	Mutual respects & willingness to help each others is evident	3.6	0.866
A24	Difference of opinion are valued	3.5	0.856
A25	Various ideas & approaches are explored	3.7	0.788
A26	Clear problem-solving process	3.4	0.743
A27	Team contributions are valued	3.0	0.898
A28	There is strong sense of team spirit	3.5	0.871

Mean score are based on 5 points scale, where '1' indicates 'strongly disagree', '2' = 'disagree', '3' = 'neutral', '4' = 'agree' > '5' = 'strongly agree'.

DIMENSIONS		MEAN	STD.DEV.
(A1,A8, A15,A22)	Purpose	13.6(3.4)	2.62(0.655)
(A2,A9, A16,A23)	Empowerment	13.7(3.4)	2.485(0.621)
(A3,A10, A17,A24)	Relationship and Common.	14.4(3.6)	2.681(0.670)
(A4,A11, A18,A25)	Flexibility	14.7(3.7)	2.298(0.575)
(A5,A12, A19,A26)	Optimal productivity	13.8(3.4)	2.289(0.572)
(A6,A13, A20,A27)	Recognition and Appreciation	13.6(3.4)	2.88(0.720)
(A7,A14, A21,A28)			
	Moral	14.0(3.5)	2.885(0.721)

The mean score for all the questions lies between minimum of 3.0 and maximum of 3.9. The median 3, lies in the ‘neutral’ scale. This indicates the neutral opinions of the respondents on most of the questions. This could also indicate apathy or non-committal of respondents towards specific team issues. Some respondents might not want to make a stand, because some of the activities might not be transparent or happening in their Departments. However, there are possibly variance in opinions towards disagree and agree. Those questions with higher means score (>3.5) probably tends to opine towards agreeing, while the lower means score (3.5<) tends to lean towards disagreeing. For example, for question no. 4. ‘Members perform different roles’, the mean is high (3.9) indicating general agreement amongst respondents. Members also tend to agree on commitment towards common purpose, express themselves openly, feel good for being member of a particular team; they can express

warmth, understanding and acceptance openly; share responsibility for team and various approaches are explored.

For question 27 which recorded the lowest score (3.0), respondents tended not to agree that team contributions were valued. General disagreement were also observed for questions that address existence of policies and practices that support team, strategies for achieving goal and clear roles for individual.

For the 7 dimensions of 'Team Performance Rating', members tended to agree on the existence of flexibility (mean score 3.7) in the organisation. This finding is quite accurate considering standard deviation of 0.575, the lowest among the dimensions. Members tended to agree also on good relationship and communication amongst members (mean = 3.6). Members had doubt on purpose (mean = 3.4), Empowerment (mean = 3.4), optimal productivity (mean = 3.4) and recognition and appreciation (mean = 3.4). The author can confirm that most of the issues brought up by members during post dialogue sessions of the 'Team Dynamics' programme were related to these areas.

Team Performance Rating By Management Level

Table 4 examines the relationship of 'Team Performance Rating' by Managerial Level.

TABLE 4**TEAM PERFORMANCE RATING BY MANAGEMENT LEVEL**

NO.	MEAN SCORE			
		EXEC.	MNGRS.	SIG.*
A1	Members are committed to a common purpose	3.5	3.8	0.012*
A2	Collective sense of power	3.3	3.5	0.238
A3	Members express themselves openly	3.5	3.9	0.025*
A4	Members perform different roles	3.7	3.9	0.324
A5	Output is high	3.3	3.7	0.023*
A6	Individual contributions appreciated by leader	3.4	3.7	0.138
A7	Feel good about membership	3.5	3.8	0.153
A8	Goals are clear	3.3	3.6	0.094
A9	Members have access to necessary skills	3.3	3.7	0.054*
A10	Warmth, understanding and acceptance is expressed	3.5	3.8	0.104
A11	Members share responsibility for team	3.5	3.9	0.014*
A12	Quality is excellent	3.3	3.5	0.224
A13	Team accomplishment is recognised	3.4	3.8	0.006*
A14	Individuals are confident	3.4	3.9	0.687
A15	Strategies for achieving goal	3.1	3.4	0.088
A16	Policies & practices support team	3.2	3.4	0.225
A17	Members listen attentively to each other	3.5	3.9	0.006*
A18	Members are adaptable to changing demands	3.4	3.7	0.140
A19	Team decision making is effective	3.4	3.6	0.263

A20	Group members feel respected	3.4	3.6	0.264
A21	Members have a sense of pride	3.3	3.6	0.060*
A22	Individual roles are clear	3.1	3.7	0.002*
A23	Mutual respects & willingness to help each others is evident	3.4	3.9	0.014
A24	Differences of opinion are valued	3.4	3.8	0.060*
A25	Various ideas & approaches are explored	3.5	4.0	0.005*
A26	Clear problem-solving process	3.2	3.6	0.015*
A27	Team contributions are valued	2.9	3.3	0.051
A28	There is strong sense of team spirit	3.4	3.7	0.177

		<u>MEAN SCORE</u>		<u>SIG.*</u>
		<u>EXEC.</u>	<u>MNGRS</u>	
(A1,A8,A15, A22)	Purpose	3.3	3.6	0.004*
(A2,A9,A16,A 23)	Empowerment	3.3	3.6	0.024*
(A3,A10,A10, A24)	Relationship and Common.	3.5	3.8	0.007*
(A4,A11,A18, A25)	Flexibility	3.5	3.9	0.006*
(A6,A12,A19, A26)	Optimal productivity	3.3	3.6	0.085
(A6,A13,A20, A27)	Recognition and Appreciate.	3.3	3.6	0.027*
(A7, A14 A21 A28)	Moral	3.3	3.6	0.129

Mean score are based on 5 points scale, where '1' indicates 'strongly disagree', '2' = 'disagree', '3' = 'neutral', '4' = 'agree' and '5' = 'strongly agree'. T-test significant level at $p < 0.05$

The table indicates difference of opinion between the groups of executives and managers. The significance level set for analysis is for the t-test significance value less than 0.05.

Generally, mean scores on most of the items were lower for the executives compared to the managers'. The statements that brought about differences in opinion and perceptions seemed to be the ones that managers can delegate or impose to their subordinates. In this case, the subordinates are mostly executives. For example, a significant difference of opinion existed for question relating to clarity of individual roles. The executives did not seem to agree while the managers tended to agree to the statement. To summarise, the executives did not seem to agree with the managers on the following statements :-

- *Members are committed to a common purpose(0.012*)*
(Probably members are unclear of common purpose)
- *Members express themselves openly(0.025*)*
(Executives have complained before that bosses had different agenda)
- *Output is high.(0.023*)*
(Probably executives feel that everybody has not contributed enough)
- *Members share responsibility for team (0.014*)*
(Probably executives felt that the others were selfish)
- *Team accomplishment is recognised (0.006*)*
(Complaints in the past of boss's apathy and ignorance on subordinate achievements)
- *Members listen attentively to each other(0.006*)*
(Probably executives felt that others did not give good enough attention)
- *Individual roles are clear(0.002*)*
(Obviously executives felt their roles were unclear)

- *Mutual respects & willingness to help each others is evident(0.014*)
(Probably executives did not think so)*
- *Various ideas & approaches are explored (0.005*)
(Probably the executives thought that it was not good enough)*
- *Clear problem-solving process (0.015*)
(Probably executives felt there was no process at all)*

It can be seen that the most significant difference in opinion is the perception of clear individual roles. The executives were of the opinion that their roles was unclear, whereas the managers felt otherwise. The executives also felt that ideas and approaches were not explored, members did not listen attentively enough and team accomplishments were not recognised.

These significant differences in opinion between the two levels were vital indications that probably the following existed in the Departments/ Unit :-

- *Unclear transmission of information between executives and managers.*
- *'Grade' or 'level' gaps between them*
- *Misunderstanding on issues.*
- *Autocratic style of management by some managers.*
- *Managers do not listen emphatically to their subordinates.*
- *Managers not open to new ideas, especially coming from the bottom.*
- *Barrier to communication exists between executives and managers.*

However, both groups seemed to agree on the statement that were common to both groups. For example, the statement on confidence of individual. The following are statements that both parties tended to agree:-

- *Collective sense of power (0.238)*
- *Members perform different roles (0.324)*

- *Individual are confident (0.687)*
- *Policies and practices support team (0.225)*
- *Decision making is effective (0.263)*
- *Group members feel respected (0.264)*

In the case where the 28 items were grouped into 7 dimensions, 5 out of the 7 recorded significant differences. They are:-

- *Purpose (0.004*)*
- *Empowerment (0.024*)*
- *Relationship and Communication (0.007*)*
- *Flexibility (0.006)**
- *Recognition and appreciation (0.027*)*

The results probably indicated that managers had clear sense of purpose, had given enough empowerment, had established good relationship and communication, were flexible and recognised and appreciate subordinates achievement. However, the executives probably were of the perception that their superiors had not done enough in those areas.

ANALYSIS OF 'TEAM PERFORMANCE RATING' BY AGE.

TABLE 5

TEAM PERFORMANCE RATING BY AGE

NO		<u>MEAN SCORE</u>			<u>F-SIG. *</u>
		<u>25-30</u> <u>(YR.)</u>	<u>31-35</u> <u>(YR.)</u>	<u>> 35</u> <u>(YR.)</u>	
A1	Members are committed to a common purpose	3.7	3.4*	3.8*	0.018*
A2	Collective sense of power	3.4	3.2	3.5	0.267
A3	Members express themselves openly.	3.5	3.3	4.0*	0.007*
A4	Members perform different roles	3.7	3.7	3.9	0.189
A5	Output is high	3.6	3.2	3.6	0.163
A6	Individual contributions appreciated by leader	3.5	3.2	3.7	0.234
A7	Feel good about membership	3.4	3.3	3.9*	0.034*
A8	Goals are clear	3.5	3.1	3.5	0.122
A9	Members have access to necessary skills	3.3	3.5	3.5	0.772
A10	Warmth, understanding and acceptance is expressed	3.5	3.4	3.8	0.167
A11	Members share responsibility for team	3.5	3.4*	3.9*	0.033*
A12	Quality is excellent	3.4	3.2	3.5	0.132
A13	Team accomplishment is recognised	3.3	3.3	3.8	0.028
A14	Individuals are confident	3.4	3.2	3.6	0.194
A15	Strategies for achieving goal	3.1	3.0	3.5	0.101
A16	Policies & practices support team	3.3	2.9*	3.5*	0.016*
A17	Members listen attentively to each other	3.3	3.4	3.9*	0.001*

A18	Members are adaptable to changing demands	3.6	3.3	3.6	0.159
A19	Team decision making is effective	3.4	3.2*	3.7*	0.029*
A20	Group members feel respected	3.3	3.3	3.6	0.253
A21	Members have a sense of pride	3.2	3.4	3.7	0.248
A22	Individual roles are clear	3.2	2.9	3.9	0.000
A23	Mutual respects & willingness to help each others is evident	3.5	3.2*	3.*	0.012*
A24	Differences of opinion are valued	3.4	3.3	3.9	0.067
A25	Various ideas & approaches are explored	3.5	3.5	3.9	0.081
A26	Clear problem-solving process	3.3	3.0*	3.6*	0.003*
A27	Team contributions are valued	2.9	32.8	3.2	0.140
A28	There is strong sense of team spirit	3.4	3.3	3.7	0.117

ANOVA- Significance (*) by F-Probability factor level of < 0.05

Table 5 indicates mean score of ‘Team Performance Rating’ by Age Groups.

Out of the 28 questions, 10 recorded differences in opinion and perception between the different age groups. Generally, the ‘above 35 years’ age group (the senior group) scored higher, followed by the ‘25-30 years’ age group (the junior group) and the ‘31-35 years’ age group (the intermediate group) recorded the lowest score.

The 10 statements which recorded significant difference of opinion are as follows:-

- *Members are committed to a common purpose (0.018*)*
- *Members express themselves openly (0.007*)*
- *Feel good about membership (0.034*)*
- *Members share responsibility for team (0.033*)*

- *Policies & practices support team (0.016*)*
- *Members listen attentively to each other (0.001*)*
- *Team decision making is effective (0.029*)*
- *Individual roles are clear (0.000*)*
- *Mutual respects & willingness to help each others is evident (0.012*)*
- *Clear problem-solving process (0.003)**

Majority of the differences were between executives in the intermediate age group and those senior age group. The intermediate group was made up of mostly Senior Executives and Managers while the older group consisted of Managers, Senior Managers, Assistant General Managers (AGMs) and above. It is interesting to note that the junior age group did not differ very much in opinion to the senior age group.

This could probably due to the following reasons:-

- *The juniors consisted of mostly new recruitment and junior engineers who work in the field. They involved themselves in day to day operational matters and as such they have limited time to indulge in management matters. Furthermore, being new, they normally carry out tasks dished out by their bosses.*

The intermediate group consisted of were well informed executives or middle managers. They were more aggressive and critical in their views. Probably, in this survey they are letting off their feelings or gallivanting their frustration.

TABLE 6

TEAM PERFORMANCE RATING BY AGE

DIMENSIONS		MEAN SCORE			F-SIG.*
		25-31 (YR.)	31-35 (YR.)	≥ 35 (YR.)	
(A1,A8,A15,A22)	Purpose	3.3	3.1*	3.6*	0.0043*
(A2,A9,A16,A23)	Empowerment	3.4	3.2	3.6	0.0490
(A3,A10,A17,A24)	Relationship and Communication	3.4	3.3	3.9*	0.0018*
(A4,A11,A18,A25)	Flexibility	3.6	3.5*	3.9*	0.0168*
(A5,A12,A19,A26)	Optimal productivity	3.4	3.2*	3.6*	0.0049*
(A6,A13,A20,A27)	Recognition and Appreciation	3.4	3.2	3.6	0.0562
(A7,A14,A21,A28)	Moral	3.4	3.3	3.7	0.0632

ANOVA- Significance (*) by F-Probability factor level of < 0.05

In the case of the 7 dimensions of the 'Team Performance Rating', Table 6 indicates significant differences in opinion amongst the 3 age groups. Generally, the senior group scored higher on all the 7 dimensions, followed by the junior and the intermediate groups in that order. It is prudent to highlight that the intermediate group scored the lowest amongst the 3 groups again. Significant difference recorded are for the following characteristic:-

- *Purpose (0.0043*)*
- *Relationship and Communication (0.018*)*
- *Flexibility (0.0168*)*
- *Optimal Productivity (0.049*)*

For ‘purpose’, the intermediate age group members were probably unclear on the team or their Departments’ purpose, compared to as perceived by to the senior group. The junior group fared better than the intermediate group.

Members of the senior group agreed that there existed a good internal relationship and communication, of which the responsibility of implementation in the Departments/ Units lies with them . However, the two junior groups probably felt that more needed to be done to improve the existing situation.

Likewise, the seniors perceived that there was flexibility in their Departments/ Units, contrary to the opinion of the intermediate group. Once again, there was difference of opinion between the two groups in the case of ‘optimal productivity’.

Rationally, the intermediate group, being the ‘link group’ between the senior and the junior groups, should have better communication, better liaisons, better interaction and therefore better consensus with the more senior group. Being more senior and therefore presumably more enlightened in the general management aspects than the junior group, the intermediate group should not differ very much in opinion with the seniors as compared to a more junior group. This is a relevant and important finding. In fact, this might signal a potential management problem, indicating ‘barriers’ between the two age groups. Management interventions might be necessary to resolve the issue. In this case, the age groups tended to suggest that those senior in age were also senior in their positions. Thus, the earlier findings on team performance rating by managerial level can be said to be supported by the test of differences by age groups.

Team Performance Rating By Function

TABLE 7

TEAM PERFORMANCE RATING BY FUNCTION

NO		MEAN SCORE				
		MTCE	PROJ	OPER.	BMU	SIG.*
A1	Members are committed to a common purpose	3.5	3.9	3.7	3.5	0.222
A2	Collective sense of power	3.3	3.5	3.4	4.0	0.416
A3	Members express themselves openly	3.5	3.9	3.6	4.0	0.230
A4	Members perform different roles	3.7	4.0	3.6	4.3	0.202
A5	Output is high	3.4	3.9	3.3	3.5	0.052
A6	Individual contributions appreciated by leader	3.4	3.8	3.4	3.5	0.323
A7	Feel good about membership	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.5	0.526
A8	Goals are clear	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.5	0.655
A9	Members have access to necessary skills	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.8	0.536
A10	Warmth, understanding and acceptance is expressed	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.7	0.808
A11	Members share responsibility for team	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.7	0.581
A12	Quality is excellent	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.8	0.141
A13	Team accomplishment is recognised	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.5	0.539
A14	Individuals are confident	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.8	0.131
A15	Strategies for achieving goal	3.1	3.6	3.1	3.5	0.126

A16	Policies & practices support team	3.2	3.5	3.1	3.5	0.403
A17	Members listen attentively to each other	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.8	0.373
A18	Members are adaptable to changing demands	3.4	3.9	3.3	3.5	0.018*
A19	Team decision making is effective	3.3	3.7	3.5	3.8	0.329
A20	Group members feel respected	3.4	3.8	3.3	4.0	0.076
A21	Members have a sense of pride	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.5	0.232
A22	Individual roles are clear	3.3	3.7	2.6	3.5	0.055*
A23	Mutual respects & willingness to help each others is evident	3.5	3.7	3.5	4.0	0.535
A24	Differences of opinion are valued	3.4	3.7	3.5	4.0	0.413
A25	Various ideas & approaches are explored	3.5	3.9	3.7	3.8	0.526
A26	Clear problem-solving process	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.5	0.204
A27	Team contributions are valued	2.9	3.3	2.9	3.3	0.221
A28	There is strong sense of team spirit	3.2	4.0	3.5	3.3	0.006*

ANOVA- Significance (*) by F-Probability factor level of < 0.05

Team Performance Rating By Function

Table 6 shows 'Team Performance Rating' as perceived by executives from different Units/Departments. Generally, the opinions of respondents from the four Departments/ Unit did not differ significantly. However, the table indicates significant difference on a few of the statements. They are as follows:-

- *Output is high*
- *individual roles are clear*

- *Members are adaptable to changing demands*
- *There is strong sense of team spirit*

For adaptability, executives in Project Department felt that they were more adaptable to changing demands as compared to their colleague in the Operation Department. They also felt that there was a strong sense of team spirit in their Department, contrary to what was felt by executives in Transmission Maintenance and BMU .

TABLE 7(1)

TEAM PERFORMANCE RATING BY FUNCTION

	MEAN SCORE				significance
	MTCE	PROJ	OPER	BMU	
Purpose (A1,A8,A15,A22)	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.5	0.1003
Empowerment (A2,A9,A16,A23)	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.8	0.3195
Relationship and Communication. (A3,A10,A17,A24)	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.9	0.3296
Flexibility (A4,A11,A18,A25)	3.6	3.9	3.5	3.8	0.1861
Optimal productivity (A5,A12,A19,A26)	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.6	0.0365
Recognition and Appreciate. (A6,A13,A20,A27)	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.6	0.1238
Moral (A7,A14,A21,A28)	3.3	3.8	3.4	3.5	0.0628

ANOVA- Significance (*) by F-Probability factor level of < 0.05

Table 7 indicates the opinions of executives in the 4 Departments/ Unit with regard to the 7 dimensions of the 'Team Performance Rating'. There is no significant difference in opinion amongst the Departments/Unit. However, it is observed that Project Department as well as BMU consistently scored higher means than others. Conversely, the other 2 Departments, particularly the Transmission Maintenance

Departments scored lower than the rest. It can be probably inferred that those Department with lower mean score should embark more aggressively on improvement programme.

ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVENESS OF ‘TEAM DYNAMICS ‘ PROGRAMME

Table 8 shows mean score and standard deviation for each of the questions in ‘Effectiveness of Team Dynamics’ construct. Mean score for each of the questions is the average score by all the 84 respondents, while the standard deviation is the variation (inaccuracy) from the median.

TABLE 8

EFFECTIVENESS OF TEAM DYNAMICS PROGRAM

NO.	QUESTIONNAIRES	MEAN	STD.DEV.
B1	Understand teamwork better after the program	4.2	0.570
B2	I benefited from program	4.2	0.563
B3	Every team member has role to play	4.3	0.550
B4	I am more willing to contribute to team	4.0	0.744
B5	Working atmosphere improved after the program	3.3	0.747
B6	Communications has improved in my Dept.	3.5	0.814
B7	Efforts are taken by superior to improve work relationship.	3.3	0.918
B8	No there are platforms set up to discuss issues	3.4	0.867
B9	Problems are raised openly at meetings	3.3	0.809
B10	Co-operation among members is better now	3.5	0.813
B11	Members are more committed towards objectives now	3.4	0.776
B12	Teamwork success depends on efforts	4.4	0.682

Mean score are based on 5 points scale, where '1' indicates 'strongly disagree', '2' = 'disagree', '3' = 'neutral', '4' = 'agree' and '5' = 'strongly agree'.

The mean score for the 84 respondents range from 3.3 to 4.4. It is possible to draw certain inference by looking at the respondents' tendency to agree to some of the statements and to disagree on some others . By grouping those statements with higher and lower means separately, it may be possible to group some of the elements which can bring about effectiveness in 'Team Dynamic Programme' and vice-versa.

The following are the questions with high mean scores :-

- *Understand teamwork better after the program*
- *I benefited from program*
- *Every team member has role to play*
- *Team objectives are more important*
- *I am more willing to contribute to team*
- *Teamwork success depends on efforts*

NOTE:-It is interesting to note that for all the 'high' scoring statements, the SD are low (around 0.56), indicating accuracy of the response.

The 'low' scoring statements are as follows:

- *Working atmosphere improved after the program*
- *Efforts are taken by superior to improve work relationship.*
- *Consultative management is practised*
- *Consensus is used for decision making*
- *Communication channels are created*

It can be inferred that by looking at the statements with ‘high’ mean scores, that these were the “should have/be” elements that must be present to ensure effectiveness of the ‘Team Dynamics’ programme. Conversely, by observing the statements with the ‘low’ mean scores, these results point out that these important elements are “ not present” in the Departments/Unit at the moment.

Everybody seemed to agree that the programme can bring in benefits to the Division, and yet the ingredients to ensure its success are not in place. The results also indicate that probably the local management is not doing enough to promote teamwork in their respective Departments/Units.

Effectiveness Of Team Dynamics Program By Managerial Levels

TABLE 9

EFFECTIVENESS OF TEAM DYNAMICS PROGRAM BY MANAGERIAL LEVELS

		MEANS		
		EXECUTIVE	MANAGERS	SIGNIFICANCE
		YES		*
B1	Understand teamwork better after the program	4.2	4.2	0.968
B2	I benefited from program	4.2	4.1	0.776
B3	Every team member has role to play	4.2	4.4	0.281

B4	More willing to contribute to team	4.1	3.9	0.170
B5	Working atmosphere improved after the program	3.2	3.5	0.184
B6	Communications has improved in my Dept.	3.5	3.5	0.757
B7	Efforts taken by superior to improve work relationship.	3.2	3.5	0.09
B8	Now there are platforms set up to discuss issues	3.2	3.7	0.017*
B9	Problems are raised openly at meetings	3.3	3.3	0.915
B10	Co-operation among members is better now	3.4	3.6	0.173
B11	Members are more committed towards objectives now	3.3	3.5	0.226
B12	Teamwork success depends on efforts	4.4	4.5	0.522
B13	Managers are taking more efforts to improve performance through teamwork.	3.3	3.8	0.008*
B14	Consultative management is practised	3.1	3.6	0.001*
B15	Consensus is used for decision making	3.1	3.5	0.040*
B16	Communication channels are created	3.2	3.4	0.152
B17	Team objectives are more important	3.9	4.1	0.277
B18	Understand vision & mission of org. better now	3.4	3.8	0.020*
B19	Top management support is important	4.3	4.1	0.500

Mean score are based on 5 points scale, where '1' indicates 'strongly disagree', '2' = 'disagree', '3' = 'neutral', '4' = 'agree' and

'5' = 'strongly agree'. T-test significant level at $p < 0.05$

Table 9 indicates the effectiveness of 'Team Dynamics' programme as perceived by the 2 managerial levels, i.e. the executives and the managers.

There were good correlation between the 2 groups for the statements with high mean scores mentioned earlier. This means that regardless of the managerial levels they are in, the respondents agree on 'should have/be' items. On some other statements, the opinion differs significantly.

These items are as follows:-

- **Now there are platforms set up to discuss issues (0.017)***
- **Managers are taking more efforts (0.008*)**
- **Consultative management is practised (0.001*)**
- **Consensus is used for decision making (0.040*)**
- **Understand vision & mission of org. better now (0.020*)**

In this case, probably the managers groups felt that they had done their jobs by providing those management tools like discussion platforms, consultation and consensus in decision making. They also probably felt that they had given a lot of efforts to their works and had taken initiatives to ensure vision and mission of Tenaga understood by all level of staff in the division.

Another important inference from the result tabulated above is that the 2 groups seem to 'agree' on the 'disagreement' items. These items include 'problems are raised

openly at meetings'. Both groups probably felt that executives, regardless of their working levels or grades, did not raise problem openly at meeting.

Effectiveness Of Team Dynamics Program By Age

TABLE 10

EFFECTIVENESS OF TEAM DYNAMICS PROGRAM BY AGE

		MEAN SCORE			F VALUE*
		25-30 (YR.)	31-35 (YR.)	> 35 (YR.)	
B1	Understand teamwork better after the program	4.1	4.1	4.2	0.659
B2	I benefited from program	4.3	4.1	4.1	0.497
B3	Every team member has role to play	4.3	4.2	4.3	0.681
B4	More willing to contribute to team	4.3	3.9	3.9	0.198
B5	Working atmosphere improved after the program	3.3	3.0*	3.5*	0.020*
B6	Communications has improved in my Dept.	3.5	3.3	3.6	0.249
B7	Efforts taken by superior to improve work relationship.	3.5	3.0	3.5	0.078
B8	Now there are platforms set up to discuss issues	3.4	3.0*	3.6*	0.026*
B9	Problems are raised openly at meetings	3.5	3.1	3.3	0.246
B10	Co-operation among members is better now	3.4	3.3	3.6	0.268
B11	Members are more committed towards objectives now	3.5	3.0*	3.6*	0.027*
B12	Teamwork success depends on efforts	4.7	4.2	4.4	0.081
B13	Managers are taking more efforts	3.5	3.1*	3.7*	0.039*
B14	Consultative management is practised	3.2	3.0*	3.5*	0.031*
B15	Consensus is used for decision making	3.3	3.0	3.4	0.175

B16	Communication channels are created	3.3	3.0	3.4	0.100
B17	Team objectives are more important	4.0	3.7	4.1	0.240
B18	Understand vision & mission of org. better now	3.5	3.2*	3.9*	0.003*
B19	Top management support is important	4.4	3.9	4.3	0.146

ANOVA- Significance (*) by F-Probability factor level of < 0.05

Table 10 indicates the effectiveness of 'Team Dynamics' programme as perceived by the executives at different age group, i.e. the '25-30 years' age group (the junior group), the '31-35 years' age group (the intermediate group) and the '35 years and above' age group (the senior group).

The 3 groups were in consensus as far as most of the statements with high mean scores were concerned, with the exception of teamwork success that is dependent on effort. However each group gave the 'teamwork success depend on efforts' element high score (exceeding 4). For convenience, the statements with high mean scores are as follows:-

- *Understand teamwork better after the program*
- *I benefited from program*
- *Every team member has role to play*
- *Team objectives are more important*
- *I am more willing to contribute to team*
- *Teamwork success depends on efforts*

However, as in the case of 'Team Performance Rating', the intermediate group differed significantly with the senior group on a number of statements. Mostly these,

statements are the ‘low’ scoring statements. In fact, at probability level of less than 0.05 using one way ANOVA, all the significant differences recorded involved the intermediate and the senior level. The 2 different age group had significant differences of opinion for the following statements:

- *Working atmosphere improved after the program (0.020)*
- *Now there are platforms set up to discuss issues (0.026*)*
- *Members are more committed towards objectives now (0.027*)*
- *Managers are taking more efforts (0.039*)*
- *Consultative management is practised (0.031*)*
- *Understand vision & mission of org. better now (0.003*)*

Most important inference that can be made from difference of opinions on ‘Effectiveness of Team Dynamics Program’ by Age is the disagreement between the senior group and the intermediate group. There is indication of consistency in their disagreement as it appeared again in this construct and this can probably be an important finding in this study.

Effectiveness Of Team Dynamics Program By Function

TABLE 11

EFFECTIVENESS OF TEAM DYNAMICS PROGRAM BY FUNCTION

		MEAN SCORE				
		MTCE	PROJ	OPER.	BMU	F-VALUE*
B1	Understand teamwork better after the program	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.3	0.254
B2	I benefited from program	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.3	0.369
B3	Every team member has role to play	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.8	0.312

3
.
.
.

B4	More willing to contribute to team	3.8	4.1	4.1	4.0	0.368
B5	Working atmosphere improved after the program	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.8	0.589
B6	Communications has improved in my Dept.	3.4	3.7	3.5	4.0	0.355
B7	Efforts taken by superior to improve work relationship.	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.8	0.602
B8	Now there are platforms set up to discuss issues	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.8	0.689
B9	Problems are raised openly at meetings	3.2	3.4	3.3	4.0	0.215
B10	Co-operation among members is better now	3.3	3.6	3.5	3.5	0.737
B11	Members are more committed towards objectives now	3.2	3.4	3.5	4.0	0.225
B12	Teamwork success depends on efforts	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.5	0.467
B13	Managers are taking more efforts	3.4	3.5	3.5	4.0	0.691
B14	Consultative management is practised	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	0.981
B15	Consensus is used for decision making	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.8	0.501
B16	Communication channels are created	3.2	3.3	3.2	4.0	0.361
B17	Team objectives are more important	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.5	0.405
B18	Understand vision & mission of org. better now	3.4	3.7	3.7	4.0	0.549
B19	Top management support is important	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.0	0.808

ANOVA- Significance (*) by F-Probability factor level of < 0.05

Table 11 indicates the 'Effectiveness of Team Dynamics Programme' by functions.

At a glance, there is no significant difference in opinion of executives on the effectiveness regardless in which Departments/Unit they work in. There seemed to be general agreements on most of the issues, particularly those issues brought up earlier in analysing the mean score and standard deviation of the general responses. BMU executives generally gave higher score as compared to the rest. Probably the effectiveness of the program was more felt in BMU. Once again, Transmission Maintenance Department fared lower in the scoring, indicating probably, the impact of the programme in Transmission Maintenance is minimal. Some recommendation can be proposed for the different Departments.

ASSESSING GROUP EFFECTIVENESS

Part 1 of Section C was to assess development strategies to achieve group effectiveness in a teams, units, departments etc. In this study, respondents were to respond with regard to their respective Departments/Unit. Table 12 shows the mean score and standard deviation for group effectiveness. Nine elements were asked and respondents were responding to the scale for this survey ranged from 1 to 7. (Please refer to Appendix 1 for the detail of the scale). Median for the scale is 4.

As can be seen from the table, the average score by the respondents range from 4.3 to 4.7. This indicates that respondents tended to lean slightly towards the positive aspects

of each of the 9 elements. For example for, ‘Communication Ability, ‘1’ would present ‘Guarded, cautious’ while ‘7’ would present ‘Open, honest’.

TABLE 12
ASSESSING GROUP EFFECTIVENESS

NO.	QUESTIONNAIRES	MEAN	STD. DEV.
C1	Communication ability	4.7	1.034
C2	Feeling of mutual support	4.6	1.128
C3	Group goals	4.5	1.176
C4	Handling conflicts	4.5	1.103
C5	Trust between individuals	4.6	1.185
C6	Control	4.6	1.161
C7	Use of resources	4.3	1.407
C8	Leadership	4.6	1.216
C9	Participation and commitment	4.5	1.321

Note: Scale from 1 to 7. For the keys to scale, please refer to Section Appendix 1 (The survey form)

The results indicates that respondents tended to agree slightly but not convincingly, that the proposed strategies are right strategies to develop group effectiveness in various Departments/Units.

Assessing Group Effectiveness By Managerial Level

Table 13 indicates ‘ Assessing Group Effectiveness by Managerial Level’

TABLE 13

ASSESSING GROUP EFFECTIVENESS BY MANAGERIAL LEVEL

		<u>MEAN SCORE</u>		
		<u>EXEC.</u>	<u>MNGRS</u>	<u>SIG.*</u>
C1	Communication ability	4.6	4.9	0.192
C2	Feeling of mutual support	4.5	4.8	0.142
C3	Group goals	4.3	4.9	0.023*
C4	Handling conflicts	4.5	4.7	0.353
C5	Trust between individuals	4.3	5.0	0.007*
C6	Control	4.4	4.9	0.0397*
C7	Use of resources	4.1	4.6	0.132
C8	Leadership	4.4	4.8	0.193
C9	Participation and commitment	4.3	4.8	0.067

Note: For the keys to scale, please refer to Appendix I. t-test probability significance < 0.05

There are 3 elements out the total 9 with indication of significant difference between the executives group and the managerial group. The managers group averaged a higher score compared to the executives group on these 3 elements. The elements are as follows:-

- *Group goals (0.023*)*
- *Trust between individuals (0.007*)*
- *Control (0.00397*)*

In the case of group goals, probably the executives WERE still unclear on vision, mission, objectives and goals. In some cases, executives were not involved on policy matters that encompassed the management aspects of the organisation. They were more concerned with day-to-day operation of the business.

On trust, the executive scored a low mean as well. This could be probably due to the executives themselves, not trusting others, especially their superior.

Of course, when it comes to control, at their levels, executives probably has no or little control over the Departmental or Unit matters. They are the ‘doers’ and this could probably be the perception of their superiors (managers).

Assessing Group Effectiveness By Age

Table 14 indicates group effectiveness by age.

TABLE 14

ASSESSING GROUP EFFECTIVENESS BY AGE

		<u>MEAN SCORE</u>			<u>SIG.*</u>
		<u>25-30</u> <u>(YR.)</u>	<u>31-35</u> <u>(YR.)</u>	<u>> 35</u> <u>(YR.)</u>	
C1	Communication ability	4.9	4.3	4.9	0.0858
C2	Feeling of mutual support	4.7	4.2	4.9	0.0792
C3	Group goals	4.4	4.3	4.8	0.1659
C4	Handling conflicts	4.8	4.0*	4.7	0.0155*
C5	Trust between individuals	4.3	4.1	5.0*	0.0029*

C6	Control	4.6	4.3	4.9	0.644
C7	Use of resources	4.4	3.5*	4.8*	0.0030*
C8	Leadership	4.6	4.0*	4.9*	0.0139*
C9	Participation and commitment	4.4	4.0*	5.0*	0.01429*

Note: For the keys to scale, please refer to Appendix 1. F-probability <0.05

There are 5 elements that the different age groups differed their opinions in. They are as follows:-

- *Handling conflicts*
- *Handling conflicts*
- *Use of resources*
- *Leadership*
- *Participation and commitment*

Again, it is observed that the different of opinion occurred between the ‘intermediate group’ and the ‘senior group’. The ‘junior’ group shows the tendency of agreeing with the ‘senior’ group. Again, the ‘senior’, scoring higher means felt that the more positive response to the elements, the more ‘correct’ the development strategies towards achieving group effectiveness. The ‘intermediate’ group felt otherwise. Could this indicates resentment or rejection on their part?

Probable reasons were explained during analysis of ‘Team Performance Rating’ earlier in this chapter.

Assessing Group Effectiveness By Functions

Table 15 show assessment of group effectiveness by functions

TABLE 15**ASSESSING GROUP EFFECTIVENESS BY FUNCTIONS**

		MEAN SCORE				F-VALUE
		MTCE	PROJ	OPER	BMU	*
C1	Communication ability	4.6	5.0	4.4*	5.8*	0.030*
C2	Feeling of mutual support	4.7	4.8	4.3	5.8	0.0664
C3	Group goals	4.5	4.7	4.3	5.5	0.2223
C4	Handling conflicts	4.5	4.7	4.3	5.8	0.0589
C5	Trust between individuals	4.5	4.6	4.6	5.0	0.9019
C6	Control	4.5	4.8	4.4	6.0	0.0476
C7	Use of resources	4.0	5.0*	3.9*	5.5	0.0058
C8	Leadership	4.4	5.0	4.2	5.5	0.044
C9	Participation and commitment	4.3	4.9	4.4	5.3	0.2177

Note: For the questionnaires refer to Appendix I. F-probability <0.05

There is no major, significant difference in assessing group effectiveness as far as the opinion of respondents from different Departments/Unit are concerns. Nevertheless on the elements of communication ability, the respondents from BMU differ significantly with their counterparts from Transmission Operations. This could be probably due to the nature of works in these 2 Units. In BMU, executives need to interact much more in their daily work while in Transmission Operation, the nature of work include dealing with control panels and man-machine interface. There is avenue to recommend improvement in Transmission Operation on this aspects.

Assessing Interpersonal Processes

Part 2 of Section C examines ‘Interpersonal Process’ in a team. The 5 questions in this Part address interpersonal relationship in a team (Table 16).

TABLE 16

ASSESSING INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES

NO.	QUESTIONNAIRES	MEAN	STD. DEV.
C1A	Listen attentively to each other.	3.3	0.636
C2A	Members support one another	3.4	0.652
C3A	Differ constructively to one another	3.1	0.677
C4A	Participate equally in discussion.	3.3	0.72
C5A	Discuss how well group is functioning	3.1	0.822

1 = Not at all 2 = To a small extent 3 = Moderate extent 4 = Great extent 5 = Very great extent.

The mean score ranged from 3.1 to 3.4. Median for the score is 3 which means to a moderate extent. Respondents felt that ‘Members support one another’ (mean = 3.4). However, to the question of differing constructively to one another, respondents did not feel very strong about it (mean = 3.1). Similarly on whether there is discussion on how well the group is functioning, the response is just to a moderate extent.

Assessing Interpersonal Processes By Managerial Level

Table 17 describes the assessment of interpersonal process by managerial levels.

TABLE 17

ASSESSING INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES BY MANAGERIAL LEVELS

		MEAN SCORE		SIG.*
		EXEC.	MNGRS	
C1A	Listen attentively to each other.	3.1	3.5	0.011*
C2A	Members support one another	3.2	3.5	0.265
C3A	Differ constructively to one another	3.0	3.3	0.066
C4A	Participate equally in discussion.	3.2	3.5	0.076
C5A	Discuss how well the group is functioning	3.0	3.3	0.043*

The table indicates that the only significant difference is that the executive group felt that members of team were not listening attentively enough to each other. On the contrary, the managers group felt that enough listening takes place in the team. Probably, the managers group felt that they have been given 'listening' attention, bearing in mind they were the ones who did all the talking.

Probably, the managers group can take the cue from the findings that not enough listening is taking place in their office.

Assessing Interpersonal Processes By Age

Table 18 indicates assessing interpersonal process by age.

TABLE 18
ASSESSING INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES BY AGE

		MEAN SCORE			SIG.*
		25-30 (YR.)	31-35 (YR.)	>35 (YR.)	
C1A	Listen attentively to each other.	3.3	3.0*	3.5*	0.025*
C2A	Members support one another	3.4	3.2	3.4	0.416
C3A	Differ constructively to one another	3.1	3.0	3.2	0.564
C4A	Participate equally in discussion.	3.2	3.1*	3.6*	0.017*
C5A	Discuss how well the group is functioning	3.1	2.8*	3.3*	0.045*

1 = Not at all 2 = To a small extent 3 = Moderate extent 4 = Great extent
5 = Very great extent.

The ‘senior’ group scored higher means, followed by the ‘junior’ and the ‘intermediate’ group in that sequence. Once again, it is noted that difference in opinion occurred between the ‘senior’ and the ‘intermediate’ group.

The difference are in the following respects :-

- *Listen attentively to each other*
- *Participate equally in discussion*

- *Discuss how well the group is functioning*

The ‘intermediate ‘ group felt that there was not enough listening in a team, while the ‘senior’ felt that attentive listening among members of team is taking place in the team. In term of participative discussion, the ‘intermediate’ group felt that there was moderate participation while the ‘senior’ felt that participation was taking place to a great extent. There was also difference of opinion of whether there exist discussion on how well the group is doing. The former felt that it is practically non-existence while the latter felt otherwise.

The basic inference again is that the difference in opinion occurred significantly between the ‘intermediate group’ and the ‘senior group’

Assessing Interpersonal Processes By Function

Table 19 shows the assessing of interpersonal processes by function

TABLE 19

ASSESSING INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES BY FUNCTION

		<u>MEAN SCORE</u>				<u>SIG.*</u>
		<u>MTCE</u>	<u>PROJ</u>	<u>OPER</u>	<u>BMU</u>	
C1A	Listen attentively to each other.	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.3	0.687
C2A	Members support one another	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.8	0.385
C3A	Differ constructively to one another	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.5	0.525
C4A	Participate equally in discussion.	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.3	0.625
C5A	Discuss how well the group is functioning	3.0	3.3	2.9	3.8	0.148

1 = Not at all 2 = To a small extent 3 = Moderate extent 4 = Great extent 5 = Very great extent.

The following scale were used:(F-probability <0.05)

There is no significant difference in opinion of respondents from the various Departments/Unit on the interpersonal process.

Results Of Reliability Tests

TABLE 20

RESULTS OF RELIABILITY TESTS

SECTION	NO.OF ITEMS	RELIABILITY COEFF. (STANDARDIS ED ITEM ALPHA)
SECTION C		
Purpose	4	0.8140
Empowerment	4	0.7509
Relatiopnship and communication	4	0.8291
Flexibility	4	0.7143
Optimal Productivity	4	0.7573
Recognition and Appreciation	4	0.8270
Moral	4	0.8535
SECTION B		
Effectiveness of ‘Team Dynamics’ programme	19	0.9159
SECTION C		

Group Effectiveness	7	0.9302
Interpersonal Processes	5	0.7724

Table 19 indicates the reliability test result o the constructs in Section A, Section B, Section C.

In Section A, the reliability coefficient for the 7 dimensions of ‘Team Performance Rating’ range from 0.7143 to 0.8535. ‘Morality’ is the most reliable dimensions and Flexibility is the least reliable. Overall reliability for ‘Team Performance Rating’ can be considered as moderate.

Reliability coefficient for ‘Effectiveness of ‘Team Dynamics’ Programme’ (Section B) is considered good, at 0.9159. Considering the questions were designed by the author and final version was firmed up after discussion with his supervisor, the questions are reliable and probably can be put into similar use in the future.

In Section C, for Part 1 which addresses ‘Group Effectiveness’, the reliability coefficient of 0.9302 is recorded.The set of questions is good and reliable in indicating ‘Group Effectiveness’.

The reliability coefficient for Part 2, ‘Interpersonal Processes’ is moderate at 0.7724 .