

## **CHAPTER V**

### **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

An overview of the study, a summary of the research results, the implication of the results and recommendation, the limitation of the study and recommendation for future research are presented in this chapter.

#### **Overview of the study**

Primary data were obtained from a random sample of 84 executives of Transmission Division of Tenaga Nasional Berhad. The sample consisted of all Grades of executives, serving all the 4 Departments/ Unit under the Transmission Division across the country.

An attempt was made in this study to find out the perception and opinion of the respondents on the 7 dimensions ( purpose, empowerment, relationship and communication, flexibility, optimal productivity, recognition and appreciation, moral) that contribute to the 'Team Performance Rating'. The exercise would give an indication where, in the opinion of the respondents, their respective Departments/Unit stand in performance as far as teamwork is concerned.

'Purpose' would indicate whether their respective teams are clear of common goals and objectives, whether there exist strategies and action plans to drive them

towards achieving the team goals and whether individuals are clear of their roles and responsibilities in the team.

'Empowerment' would establish the fact whether the team has collective sense of power, members are supportive and are willing to assist one another and whether there are policies and practices to support teamwork.

‘Relationship and communication’ helps to determine whether members of the team can express themselves clearly, listen to one another emphatically, value others opinion and express understanding and acceptance.

‘Flexibility’ attempt to express the different roles of members in the team, sharing of responsibilities by members, adaptability of members to the changing surroundings and willingness of the team to explore different ideas and approaches.

By 'optimal productivity' it means that member of the team concur that the team output is high, quality of output is excellent, team decision making is effective and there exist clear problem-solving process and methodology.

‘Recognition and appreciation’ means that contribution of each individual members are appreciated by the team leader, there is always recognition for teams’ accomplishments, all the members in the group feel that they are respected and their contribution are valued.

‘Moral’ would interpret that each of the team members feels good to be in the team, that they are confident in discharging their duties, they are proud of their works and there is ‘esprit-de-corp.’ in the team.

This study also attempts to measure the effectiveness of the 'Team Dynamics' programme which was administered to the executives of the Transmission Division between March and November 1995. During the programme, important concepts and aspects of teams and teambuilding like communication, co-operation and commitment were disseminated. Respondents were also involved in management case studies and games that brought about awareness and understanding, as well as the traits and attributes of building efficient and effective teams. Leadership aspects and vital steps in transferring of an unproductive and lethargic team into a dynamic and vibrant ones was also made known to the participants.

Questions that were asked touch on understanding of teams and teamwork concepts, comparing of the situation in the Departments/Unit before and after the programme, changes of attitudes towards teams and action taken to establish and enhance teamwork in the respective Departments/Unit. The respondents were also asked open-ended questions on advantages and disadvantages of the programme and to propose suggestions to improve the programme.

For 'Group Effectiveness', elements of communication ability, feelings of mutual support, group goals, handling conflicts, trust between individuals, control, use of resources, leadership and participation and commitment were gauged.

'Interpersonal Processes' touches and gives emphasis on interpersonal relationship particularly in the area of communication between team members

## SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH RESULTS

### Mean Score of 'Team Performance Rating'

The survey revealed that in Section A, where respondents' score on 'Team Performance Rating' was being assessed, the means score for the 28 questions varied between a low of 3.0 and a high of 3.9. It is probably more relevant to comment on the 7 dimensions score which varied from a low of 3.4 to a high of 3.7.

The survey registered (from content analysis) a low score of less than 3.5 for purpose (more than 56% of respondents), empowerment (more than 57% of respondents), optimal productivity (more than 59.5% of respondents), recognition and appreciation (more than 50% of respondents) and moral (more than 51% of respondents).

This probably revealed that:

- *Quite a large percentage of executives were unclear and unsure of Departments/Unit purpose and objectives.*
- *In term of empowerment, the Departments/Unit did not possess a collective sense of power, there were no policies and practices that support teamwork, members were not supportive and not willing to assist one another in their work.*
- *In the case of optimal productivity, members were of the opinion that the output and quality were still low, team decision making was ineffective and there was no problem solving processes and mechanism in the team*



- *In term of recognition and appreciation, there was little, if any, appreciation by leaders on contribution of individual members, no recognition on team achievements, members did not feel respected and their contributions were not valued.*
- *In the case of moral, members felt that 'esprit-de-corp' hardly existed, members are not confident in discharging their duties, members were not satisfied and did not take pride in their daily works and there was no pride for being a member of the team.*

The dimensions that scored a higher means (greater than 3.5) include relationship and communication ( more than 59% of respondents), flexibility, (more than 61 % of respondents).

The following could possibly be inferred :-

- *In term of relationship and communication, members probably could express themselves clearly, there was a good listening ability in the group, others opinion were valued and members were quite open in expressing understanding and acceptance.*
- *In the case of flexibility, members were quite aware of their different roles, they did not mind sharing responsibilities with others, they were quite adaptable and were willing to explore new ideas and approaches.*

#### Team Performance Rating by Managerial Levels.

Generally, the executives' means score were lower than the managers' score.

The questions that brought about significant differences in opinion were the ones that managers, at their level, could delegate and impose on the executives, who were

mostly subordinates. A good example was for question number 22, where individual roles were supposedly to be clear. The executives did not agree while the managers tended to agree to the statement.

As a summary, as compared to the managers, the executives scored lower for the following statements with the probable reasons :-

- **Members are committed to a common purpose.**

*Probably executives were unclear of the common team purposes*

- **Members express themselves openly.**

*Executives probably felt that they have complained before and their managers were indifferent on many issues. Executives were also afraid of repercussion like victimisation on their opportunities for promotion and annual increment.*

- **Output is high**

*Executives probably felt that members of teams have not contributed enough to productivity .*

- **Members share responsibility for team**

*Executives felt that responsibilities were not shared equally and as the result, their group was burden with most of the difficult tasks.*

- **Team accomplishment is recognised**

*Based on issues raised in the past, especially during the "Team Dynamics" programme, executive felt that their accomplishment were not appreciated.*

- **Members listen attentively to each other.**

*Executives felt that there was not much of emphatic listening by members of the team.*

- **Individual roles are clear.**

*Executives expressed their scepticism on this statement.*

- **Mutual respects & willingness to help each others is evident.**

*Executives probably felt that much more was to be desired in this area.*

- **Various ideas & approaches are explored.**

*Executives probably felt that ideas were being shot down at and there was insufficient initiatives to explore.*

- **Clear problem-solving process .**

*Executives felt that the mechanism was non-existence.*

These significant differences in opinion between the two levels are vital

indications that probably there exist in the Departments/ Unit :-

- *Problem in vertical communication between the managerial levels.*
- *Poor flow of information between executives and managers levels, probably due to poor mechanism.*
- *There exists 'Grade' or 'level' gaps between the two levels.*
- *Misunderstanding on common issues and no platform to resolve misapprehension.*
- *Autocratic style of management by some managers.*
- *Managers fail to appreciate the needs to listen emphatically.*

- *Managers were not open to new ideas, especially coming from the bottom.*

However, there were agreement by both the groups, on statements that commonly affected them. Good example was question number 14, on confidence of individual. The following were statements that both parties seemed to agree :-

- *Collective sense of power.*
- *Members perform different roles.*
- *Individual are confident.*
- *Policies and practices support team.*
- *Decision making is effective.*
- *Group members feel respected.*

In the case of the 7 dimensions, 5 out of the 7 characteristics recorded significant differences in perception and opinion between the 2 levels. The 5 were as follows:-

- *Purpose.*
- *Empowerment.*
- *Relationship and Communication*
- *Flexibility*
- *Recognition and appreciation*

Again, in term of the mean scores, the survey reveals that the executives scored lower than the managers. The results probably indicated that managers being more senior were in better position to make decision. Managers probably perceived that they had done their duties and implemented sufficiently in these areas, whereas the

executives felt otherwise. Certainly, the differences between these two groups needed to be ironed out in order to improve organisational performance.

#### Team Performance Rating by Age.

In the analysis, the respondents were divided into the '25 - 30' years age group (the junior group), the '31 - 35' years age group (the intermediate group) and the 'above 35' years age group. In general, the senior group scored higher means followed by the junior groups. The intermediate group scored the lowest. In fact, majority of the difference recorded were between the senior and the intermediate group

The significant differences recorded were for the following questions:-

- *Members are committed to a common purpose*
- *Members express themselves openly*
- *Feel good about membership*
- *Members share responsibility for team*
- *Policies & practices support team*
- *Members listen attentively to each other*
- *Team decision making is effective*
- *Individual roles are clear*
- *Mutual respects & willingness to help each others is evident*
- *Clear problem-solving process*

The survey also revealed the differences in the views and opinions between the senior and intermediate groups in the case of the 7 dimensions of the 'Team Performance Rating'. Again the senior group scored higher means, followed by the junior groups. The intermediate group recorded the lowest score.

The dimensions that revealed significant differences were :

- *Purpose*
- *Relationship and Communication*
- *Flexibility*
- *Optimal productivity.*

#### Team Performance Rating by functions.

Generally, there is no significant difference in opinion amongst the Departments/Unit. the Project Department as well as BMU consistently scored higher means than the other two Departments. The Transmission Maintenance Departments scored lower than the rest. Significant differences was recorded for question number 28 on a strong sense of team spirit. The Project Department scored a mean of 4.0 as compared to the Transmission Maintenance Department and BMU.

In term of the 7 dimensions of 'Team Performance Rating', no significant differences were recorded for the different functional group.

### **EFFECTIVENESS OF 'TEAM DYNAMICS ' PROGRAMME**

For the effectiveness of 'Team Dynamics' programme, content analysis revealed that questions with higher mean score that is where the % in brackets indicate % of total respondents that scored more than 4 (agree) are as follows:

- *Understand teamwork better after the program (90.5%)*
- *I benefited from program ( 92.8%)*
- *Every team member has a role to play (95.2%)*

- *Team objectives are more important (72.6%)*
- *I am more willing to contribute to team (84.5%)*
- *Teamwork success depends on efforts (91.7%)*

The results revealed that these are the necessary traits that can bring about effectiveness of the 'Team Dynamics' programme.

The 'low' scoring statements and percentages of respondents scoring 4 (agree) and more are as follows:

- *Working atmosphere improved after the program (40.5%)*
- *Efforts are taken by superior to improve work relationship (47.7%).*
- *Consultative management is practised (38.1%)*
- *Consensus is used for decision making (40.5%)*
- *Communication channels are created (44.3%)*

These questions pointed out that these are probably the important elements that need to be present in the Departments/Unit, but they are missing at the moment. Therefore, these must be improved in order to promote effectiveness of the team building programme.

Respondents agreed that the programme could bring benefits to the Division, but the ingredients to ensure its success were not in place. The results also indicated that probably the management of the respective units was not doing enough to promote teamwork in their respective Departments/Units.

#### Effectiveness of the 'Team Dynamics' Programme by Managerial Levels.

In this case, regardless of the managerial levels of the, they agreed on certain statements with high scoring means. The statements are as follows:-

- *Understand teamwork better after the program (90.5%)*
- *I benefited from program ( 92.8%)*
- *Every team member has a role to play (95.2%)*
- *Team objectives are more important (72.6%)*
- *I am more willing to contribute to team (84.5%)*
- *Teamwork success depends on efforts (91.7%)*

There were marked differences in opinions on some other items. The significant differences were brought about probably by virtue of different managerial position and therefore different level of authority and empowerment.

These are for the following items :-

- *Now there are platforms set up to discuss issues*
- *Efforts are taken by superior to improve performance through teamwork.*
- *Consultative management is practised*
- *Consensus is used for decision making*
- *Understand mission and vision of organisation better now than before.*

In this case, probably the managers group 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 put up a lot of efforts to their works and had taken the initiatives to ensure vision and mission of Tenaga understood by all level of staff in the Division.

The two groups indicated their sceptism on the following statements:

- *Now there are platforms set up to discuss issues*
- *Managers are taking more efforts*
- *Consultative management is practised*



- *Consensus is used for decision making*
- *Understand vision & mission of org. better now*

Another important revelation is that both groups agreed on some of the 'low' scoring items. These items include 'problems are raised openly at meetings'. Managers group probably felt that executives have 'apathy' attitude and did not raise problem openly at meeting. The executives group probably felt that from experience, they had repeatedly raised issues but no action were taken on them, or they might be victimised for being outspoken or over critical over certain issues.

The indication of differences in opinion is vital to the Divisional management such that action can be taken to level the differences in order to implement effective teamwork in the Division.

#### EFFECTIVENESS OF TEAM DYNAMICS PROGRAMME BY AGE

Overall, the 'senior' group once again scored higher means, followed by the 'junior' group and the 'intermediate' group respectively. The 3 groups are in consensus as far as the 'high' score statements in Section B are concerned (with the exception of teamwork success depend on effort). However each group gave the 'teamwork success depend on efforts' statement a high score (exceeding 4). The 'high' scoring statements are again listed 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, it is pertinent to note that as in the case of 'Team Performance Rating', the intermediate group differed significantly to the senior group on a number of issues. Mostly, these were on the 'low' scoring statements. In fact, at F-probability level of less than, 0.05 all the significant differences recorded involved the 'intermediate' and the 'senior' groups. The 2 different age groups had significant differences of opinion on the following statements:

- *Working atmosphere improved after the program*
- *Now there are platforms set up to discuss issues*
- *Members are more committed towards objectives now*
- *Managers are taking more efforts*
- *Consultative management is practised*
- *Understand vision & mission of organisation better now.*

Most important inference that can be made from the differences of opinion on 'Effectiveness of Team Dynamics Program' by Age is again the disagreement between the senior group and the intermediate group. There is indication of consistency in their disagreement as it reappear in this construct and this can be one of the important findings in this study.

#### Effectiveness of the 'Team Dynamics' Programme by Functions.

There is no significant difference in opinion of executives on the effectiveness of the programme 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 of this Section.

## ASSESSING GROUP EFFECTIVENESS (SECTION C PART 1)

The Departments/Unit were moderately opened and honest in communicating and disseminating information. There were cohesion amongst members and genuine concerns for others were felt through out the Departments/Unit. Though not overly clear, group goals were present and understood with moderate level of commitment. Whenever there were conflicts, the group stood up to them and expressed differences to tackle them.

Elements of trust were also felt whereby information were shared to a certain extent. Some degree of collective decision making was practised with a certain levels of self-direction. Members agreed that resources were fully used and there were interdependency in discharging individual duties. There was a good acceptance and respect for present leadership and leadership needs were met. Last but not least, as far as teams were concerned, there were a good degree of participation and commitment from members.

### Group Effectiveness by Managerial Levels.

The managers group averaged a higher score compared to the executives group on 3 significant elements. The elements are as follows:-

- *Group goals*
- *Trust between individuals*
- *Control*



The only significant difference was 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 attentive listening did happen in the Departments/ Unit. Probably, the managers group perceived that they have been listening attentively, despite the fact that they were the ones who did all the talking. Probably, the managers group can take the cue from this finding that there is avenue for improvement in this area.

#### Interpersonal Processes by Age.

The ‘senior’ group scored higher means, followed by the ‘junior’ and the ‘intermediate’ group in that sequence. Once again, it is noted that significant differences 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 emphatic listening in a team, while the ‘senior’ feels that attentive listening among members of team was happening in the Departments/ Unit. In term of participative discussion, the ‘intermediate’ group feel that there was a moderate participation while the ‘senior’ was of the opinion that group participation was taking place to a great extent. There was also difference of opinion on whether there exist discussion on how well the group was

doing. The former felt that it was practically non-existence while the latter felt otherwise.

Again an importance inference is the difference in opinion occurring again between the 'intermediate group' and the 'senior group'. This reinforce the earlier findings.

#### Interpersonal Processes by functions.

There is no significant difference in opinion of respondents from the various Departments/Unit on the interpersonal process. On the contrary, there are correlation and consensus on the following (where F-probability is  $> 0.5$ ):-

- *Listen attentively to each other.*
- *Differ constructively to one another*
- *Discuss how well the group is functioning*

## **IMPLICATION OF THE STUDY AND RECOMMENDATION**

This study was performed on selected sample of respondents, in this case executives of the Transmission Division of Tenaga Nasional Berhad. The Transmission Division stands to be the direct beneficiary of the findings and recommendations of the study. The sample, by virtue of it being exclusively representing executives of a Division in Tenaga, probably with a slight inaccuracy, can also be representative of the whole executives population in Tenaga. As such, the results of this study can also be taken to reflect the current level of teamwork in Tenaga. May be, the sampling of this case can be a factor that can cause the difference. This is because it was taken from executives who had participated in the 'Team Dynamics' programme. As in the case of Transmission Division, the study has revealed that there was only a slight influence of job disciplines (functions) on the outcomes of the study. Therefore, that would add to the accuracy and reliability of the survey, if it is to be extended and administered to the other Divisions.

Certainly, it would be an interesting and useful exercise to administer the surveys to staff in Tenaga's power stations who had attended similar programme and to examine and compare the findings.

One of the primary objectives of the study was to evaluate and determine the effectiveness of the 'Team Dynamics' programme which was introduced in the Transmission Division between March and November 1995. An important attribute considered for measurement in the study was the respondents' understanding and

concurrency to the many traits of teams and teamwork, and the willingness to change and improve together as a team. In this respect, the respondents had provided some answers as can be seen from this report.

If taken as part of the Division's organisational development strategy, the results and findings of the study can serve as a useful tool to identify areas of internal strength and weakness. Based on its outcome, the Divisional management chart course of action in its human development strategy.

Heads of Departments/ Unit in Transmission Division had been very supportive and committed to the teamwork programme. The results and the implication of the study would further enhance and reinforce their beliefs and commitment. Based on the findings, they can now be more focused on areas that need improvements and sustenance.

Last but not least, the heterogeneous respondents who represented a cross section of their executive colleagues in the Division, should at least be happy and satisfied. They were given the opportunity and they participated by responding to the survey, expressing fair and impartial opinions on teamwork issues of the Division. At least for now, the critical and burning issues that were confirmed in the study would be highlighted.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the outcome of this study, the author would like to make the following

recommendations:-

1. *Tenaga Nasional Berhad, as a dynamic and progressive corporate giant in the country, to embark on teambuilding initiatives immediately in the organisation. As such, it is proposed that Tenaga incorporate 'teambuilding' in its business plan, starting in the immediate term plan.*
2. *Tenaga to establish management framework that undertake planning, promotion, implementation, maintenance, development and co-ordination of 'teams' and 'teamwork' efforts and activities in the organisation. The framework can initially be established under Total Quality Management framework.*
3. *The 'Team Dynamics' programme, an awareness programme currently ongoing and are organised by the Management Consultancy Services Department of Tenaga (MCS), to be continued to cover all Divisions in Tenaga. The relevant Unit that organises the programme is to be given full support and resources to spearhead and promote the teambuilding initiatives.*
4. *Transmission Division is to continue vigorously on the current teambuilding initiatives.*
5. *Management of Transmission Division to address and resolve critical issues highlighted in this study. Among the critical issues are:*
  - *Those that brought about significant difference of opinions between senior, middle and young managers.*
  - *Communication gaps between executives of different levels and of different age groups.*
  - *The requirements to improve interpersonal relationships.*
  - *Framework and infrastructure that need to be established and reinforced to promote and sustain teamwork.*
  - *Emphasis on sustenance and continuous efforts on teamwork, for example to encourage and monitor current teams effort like QCS-IT,*

*Quality Management Project Teams (QMPT) and Integrated Team Building programme.*

- *Possibility of quantifying the returns on teamwork investments. This might warrant an extension to this study.*

## **LIMITATION OF THE STUDY**

The findings of this exploratory research should be interpreted within the limits of its sample size (  $n = 84$  executives of the Transmission Division of Tenaga), and sample space (Transmission Division). The respondents were executives who have attended the 'Team Dynamics' programme at different times between March and November 1995.

The sampling design could be improved, that is to cover the whole population of the Transmission executives ( 205 in numbers at 31st December 1995). The response rate of the executives could have been better if not for the long holidays during which the survey was administered.

Fair cross sectional demographic distribution of survey forms to respondents was beyond the control of the author. The distribution was left to the Departmental or Unit representatives. It was done this way to enable as random a distribution as possible.

When the questionnaire was distributed, Tenaga's CEO circulated circular 7/95 on the subject of restructuring. The proposed movements and realignment of certain units was a surprise to many, and had an unsettling effect on some of the respondents. This could have affected the response rate.

## **RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

In certain circumstances, the effectiveness of the teamwork programme are evident and visible. For example, all around improvements and innovative steps that were taken after the programme by the various Departments/ Unit are practical evidence of its effectiveness. One of the outstanding outcomes of the programme is that working environment in the respective Departments and Unit have improved to a great extent. Another important milestone, was the formation of Quality Management Project Teams(QMPT) in the various Departments/ Unit. QMPT is a cross functional team meant to address important and urgent issues of the various Departments/ Unit. The idea of its formation came up from one of the post 'Team Dynamics' forum and it is also part of the teamwork development in Transmission.

In a big and dynamic organisation like Tenaga, teams can not be built overnight. There are still many areas that need to be improved and differences that need to be ironed out. The survey has managed to reveal some of this areas.

Locally, not much detailed study has been performed on teams and teamwork. This can be attributed to the subject matter being relatively new to organisations world-wide. Furthermore, the basic definition on teams and teamwork is still a debatable topics amongst management researchers world-wide. This study could form the basis of a much detail and larger research in Tenaga or other organisations in the country.

The author would recommend that if the awareness programme is introduced to cover all the Divisions in Tenaga, then similar or more detail study be performed,

especially to examine in detail the tangible returns to Tenaga. The tangible returns can be in the forms of improved performance indicators, comparing the pre and post programmes. The performance indicators can be in the forms of improved productivity (Units sold per employee), number of reduced breakdowns (breakdown per customer year), reduction in operation costs (RM per employee), increased revenue (RM per employee) and so on. Probably, one single important return to the organisation that the study on teams should focus on is the financial returns in term of the bottomline profit attributable to teamwork.

The proposed study on teams should also address planning, implementation, monitoring and sustaining framework for the organisation. The framework should cover immediate, tactical and strategic phases of teamwork development. The study should also attempt to examine the effectiveness of different activities at different phases. For example, in the team building phase, different levels of staff at varying academic qualification are subjected to similar management programme. How would the participants respond to it and how effective would the tool be in bringing different level of people together.

The study should also look at the possibility of a common programme for Tenaga, that is team building to cover staff from the various Division. The proposed common programme is especially appropriate for the top echelon of Tenaga management. Last but not least, the study can also be extended to cover other private or public organisations in the country. In the case of the Transmission Division, future

studies should include assessment on the current Integrated Teambuilding programme and the effectiveness of the Quality Management Project Team (QMPT)

In conclusion, the overall objectives of this exploratory survey has been met and therefore other objectives would have to be satisfied with different surveys.