

Team Characteristics Affecting to Team Performance

Panida Ninaroon* and Kanyanant Ananmana*

Abstract : The purpose of this research was to 1) study the factors related to team characteristics and team performance and 2) study the factors that affecting the team performance of a sales department team of a company. The sample consisted of 219 team leaders of the company. This study was quantitative in nature. Data was analyzed by multiple regressions. Research findings were as follows 1) there was a strong correlation between team characteristics 2) the factors affecting team characteristics which could be predicted by team performance at 62.23% included similarity, cohesion, familiarity and coordination at a significance level of .05. Finally, the results suggest that the characteristics of a sales team can improve team performance.

Keywords : Team Characteristics, Team Performance, Sales Team.

1. INTRODUCTION

Globalization era brings about change of organization management so the work teams are the role for survive in the organization. Furthermore, present the increasing globalization of the workforce, it has been many more meaning for example, primary dimension: age, gender, and race and secondary dimension: beliefs, background and education that can form team outcomes. (Van Dijk, van Engen, & van Knippenberg, (2012). The cross-functional teams are expanding in the organization of change (Lovelace, Shapiro, & Weingart, 2001) so the leader should know how to carry on the diversity of member in team for effect to success in the organization. The members in team have different function backgrounds (Keller, 2001) which the recent studies have found out that the functional diversity team induced to higher performance than functional team. (Homan et.al., 2008, Van Knippenberg et.al, 2004) However, sometimes team performance is reduced by knowledge of heterogeneity team. Because team performance has three methods: communication and collaboration, conflict management, and proactiveness that influenced directly to team performance. (Atanasova & Senn, 2001) On the other hand, the diversity teams should be unproductive but the homogeneous teams can more productive since frequently of the homogeneous team will attract to mutually shared among team member when they have the similar attributes. (Bell, et.al., 2011) Hence, this study argues that the diverse teams related to team performance more than the homogeneous teams.

Team performance is improved by the helping behavior among the members. (Farh, Zhong & Organ, 2004) Moreover, many research found that helping behavior occurs among the team work can promote team performance. (Podsakoff, 2003) One study defines the helping behavior as the voluntary helping behavior on working of member which gives assistance both protect or decide the problem in their team. (Choi, 2009) Helping behavior is from type of interpersonal, cooperative, and affiliative which extra role behavior led to members of working team. (Liao et.al., 2008) When members are interdependent and cooperation can enhance team performance. (Nemeth & Staw, 1989) Team performance occurs by the potential benefits of helping that collective phenomena as the performance of team accrue through the member's mutual behavior rather than isolated incidents. (Organ, 1988) Finally, the cooperation provides

* College of Innovation and Management, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Bangkok, Thailand

personal effort towards fulfillment on interdependent jobs. (Wagner, 1995) Therefore, the leader attempts to support collective behavior in team to strengthen similarity, cohesion, familiarity and coordination characteristics among team members.

Sales team compose of selling organization members distributed to special customer which is a direct concern to the development or implementation of sales strategy for the customer. (Moon & Armstrong, 1994) Nowadays the sales – based organization is changing. Since, the sales organizations are feedback by the escalating complexity, dynamism, and competition characterizing so the organization has the implementing team-based structure. Such as using team over individuals because the team is to facilitate an integration of information that effects more to advised decisions and more coordinated effort which can improve performance (Deeter-Schmelz & Ramsey, 1995; Kurniawati & MeilianaIntani, 2016; Islam, Hossain & Verpoest, 2015).

According to the study on the team behavior, it categorized in at least two types: compositional theories, which concentrate to the attributes of team members; and structural theories, which focus on the structure of interactions among them. (William & O'Really, 1998) This study presented the team characteristics as follows: similarity, cohesion, familiarity and coordination that affecting to team performance. If the organization manages team characteristics in all dimensions: (similarity, cohesion, familiarity and coordination), it might have a positive impact on team performance.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Team Similarity

Team members who have personalities that are different in communicating. (Schaubroeck & Lam, 2002) Moreover, the similarity of members can consider from personality, attitudes, and values that will be attracted each other. This selective process generates the classification in team that may affect to group outcome. (Van Knippenberg & Schipper, 2007) Follow this the individuals who perceive themselves as similar among team members found that the members have a positive attitudes and behaviors in team similarity (Goldberg, 1999) Hence, team similarity will have to shared knowledge among members which improving for teamwork toward team performance.

Team Cohesion

In a dynamic organization that has trend to stick together and remain united in the race to purposes. (Carron, Brawnley & Widmeyer, 1998) For the research in teamwork field has been used an index of social integration as team cohesion. (Hoegl & Proserpio, 2004) Mainly team cohesion has been shown to associate positively various outcomes, one of them is team performance. (Mullen & Copper, 1994) Therefore, team cohesion has a positive to team performance that is important to build the achievement for organization.

Team Familiarity

For the investigates to productivity found that the increasing the motivation and cognitive familiarity. (Wong, 2004) Team familiarity refers to the extend to which team members know each other. (Espinosa, Slaughter, Kraut & Herbsleb, 2007) Team development can develop by team members overtime and with collaboration (Guzzo & Dickson, 1996) However, team members should be anticipate and understand the unique working style and experiences of other teammates, understand every 's role, efficiency engage all teammateain the task (Balkundi & Haririson, 2006)

Team Coordination

Coordination refers to the willing contribution of personal effort in the completion of independent jobs (Wagner, 1995) and the action of team members change inputs toward outcomes through cognitive, verbal, and behavior activities conduct to achieving collective goal. (Collins & Smith, 2006) So that coordination is a crucial process which as an indicator of high performance. (Evan & Charles, 2005)

Objective

1. To study the factors related to team characteristics and team performance.
2. To study the factors that affecting the team performance of a sales department team of a company.

3. METHODOLOGY

Open-ended questionnaires were used as the research tool. They were divided into 3 sections: 1) general information of the member, 2) questions regarding the characteristics of the Sales team, and 3) questions regarding the team performance, the total number of which was 40 items. The first section consisted of Check List with one tick, the second and third sections were questions using 5 Likert Scale; Scale 1 represented “strongly disagree” and Scale 5 represented “strongly agree”.

Efficiency means measurement of performance of organization that how organization got the quantity and quality of work so efficiency means getting more quantity and quality. (Sitthiwarongchai & Jadesadalug 2016) This research studies on Team performance was measured follow: accumulative profits, market share, and share price.

Content Validity along with Index of Item - Objective Congruence (IOC) was used to test the tool. The results showed that the IOC of the questionnaire was between 0.50 and 1.00 meaning that the questions were consistent with the research objectives. The reliability of the research tool was tested with Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient. The results showed that the reliability of each aspect of questions was between 0.89 and 0.93, more than 0.70, meaning that the tool was highly reliable.

For the data collection, the population was 484 team leaders. The sample group was obtained by simple random sampling, and 219 team leaders were obtained. However, the number of questionnaires eligible for the evaluation was 219.

Descriptive Statistics along with percentage, mean, standard deviation were used to analyze the data, and the hypothesis was tested by analyzing the influence of variables by Multiple Regressions and stepwise techniques.

4. FINDINGS / RESULTS

Table 1
Analysis Result of Team Characteristics affecting to Team Performance

| <i>Question Item</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>S.D.</i> | <i>Result</i> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| Team Characteristics | | | |
| Team Similarity (X1) | 3.65 | 0.65 | High |
| Team Cohesion (X2) | 3.74 | 0.64 | High |
| Team Familiarity (X3) | 3.77 | 0.75 | Medium |
| Team Coordination (X4) | 3.34 | 0.74 | Medium |
| Summary of Team Characteristics (X) | 3.62 | 0.72 | High |
| Summary of Team Performance (Y) | 4.11 | 0.56 | High |
| Total | 3.72 | 0.65 | High |

According to Table 1 Analysis Result of Team Characteristics affecting to Team Performance, it was found that the overall opinions were at high level ($\bar{x} = 3.72$, S.D. = 0.65). Considering each aspect, it showed that team familiarity was the highest average ($\bar{x} = 3.77$, S.D. = 0.75), followed by team cohesion ($\bar{x} = 3.74$, S.D. = 0.64), and team similarity ($\bar{x} = 3.65$, S.D.= 0.65) respectively.

The analysis result of team performance (Y) showed that the overall opinions were at high level ($\bar{x} = 3.72$, S.D. = 0.65).

Table 2
Regression Analysis of Team Characteristics affecting to Team Performance

| <i>X</i> | <i>B</i> | <i>S.E.</i> | β | <i>t</i> | <i>sig</i> |
|--|----------|-------------|---------|----------|------------|
| Constant | 1.122 | 0.201 | | 5.245 | 0.000 |
| X1 | 0.302 | 0.61 | 0.277 | 4.912 | 0.000 |
| X2 | 0.178 | 0.39 | 0.262 | 4.567 | 0.000 |
| X3 | -0.210 | 0.64 | -0.254 | -3.434 | 0.001 |
| X4 | 0.272 | 0.58 | 0.278 | 4.578 | 0.000 |
| 0.05 Significance R= 0.716 R square= 0.514 Adjust R square = 0.6223 Std. Error of the Estimate = 0.39392 | | | | | |
| Multiple Regression | | | | | |
| $\hat{Y} = 1.122 + 0.302X1 + 0.178X2 - 0.210X3 + 0.272X4$ | | | | | |

According to Table 2 – The analysis result of team characteristics affecting to team Performance, it was found that the team characteristics affecting team performance could be predicted with 62.23 percent (Adjusted R2 = 0.6323) with 0.05 significant statistic: Team Similarity ($\beta = 0.277$, $p < 0.05$), Team Cohesion ($\beta = 0.262$, $p < 0.05$), Team Familiarity ($\beta = 0.254$, $p < 0.05$), Team Coordination ($\beta = 0.278$, $p < 0.05$) respectively.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, the authors tested for team characteristics that consist of similarity, cohesion, familiarity and coordination that affected to team performance. The result showed that the overall of team characteristics has a positive affects to team performance.

Team Similarity is positively affects to team performance as seen in (Schaubroeck & Lam, 2002), (Van Knippenberg & Schipper, 2007), (Goldberg, 1999) Team members who have personalities that are many different in communicating. Moreover, the similarity of members can consider from personality, attitudes, and values that will be attracted each other. This selective process generate the classification in team that may affect to group outcome. Follow this the individuals who perceive themselves as similar among team members found that the members have a positive attitudes and behaviors in team similarity.

Team Cohesion is positively affects to team performance as seen in (Carron, Brawnley & Widmeyer, 1998), (Hoegl & Proserpio, 2004), (Mullen & Copper, 1994) In a dynamics organization that is reflected trend to stick together and remain united in the race to purposes. For the research in teamwork field has been used an index of social integration as team cohesion. Mainly team cohesion has been shown to associate positively various outcomes, one of them is team performance. So the results suggest that the relationship between team cohesion and team performance.

Team Familiarity is positively affects to team performance as seen in (Wong, 2004) (Espinosa, Slaughter, Kraut & Herbsleb, 2007), (Balkundi & Haririson, 2006). For the investigates to productivity found that the increasing the motivation and cognitive familiarity Team familiarity refers to the extend to which team members know each other. Team development can develop by team members overt However, team members should be anticipate and understand the unique working style and experiences of other teammates, understand every 's role, efficiency engage all teammate in the task .

Team Coordination is positively affects to team performance as seen in (Wagner, 1995), (Collins & Smith, 2006), (Evan & Charles, 2005) Coordination refers to the willing contribution of personal

effort in the completion of independent jobs and the action of team members change inputs toward outcomes through cognitive, verbal, and behavior activities conduct to achieving collective goal. So that coordination is a crucial process which is an indicator of high performance. Therefore coordination, also sometimes called as collaboration behavior among members in teamwork. (Kratzer & Savoie, 2006) Moreover, the contribution of coordination has personal effort to the completion of independent jobs. (Wagner, 1995) The degree of coordination upon individual members is working together to achieve a team-level. (Yu&cable,2011)

Suggestions

1. At present, a diversified cultural is rising so the organization has to explore the way to manage diversity workforce. The results suggested that the team characteristics relate to team performance that members from difference culture therefore the future should to studies the collectivistic culture in team affected to team performance.
2. This research investigated the characteristics of team affecting to team performance. The results obtained from this research indicated that the characteristics of team influenced to team performance. Therefore, the approaches to increase team performance should be studied to build the team characteristics that distribute among members are helping behavior consist: similarity, cohesion, familiarity, and coordination. Teamwork will also become a driving force leading the organization to grown and survive the globalization.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank the Research and Development Institute, College of Innovation and Management, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Bangkok, Thailand for financial support.

7. REFERENCES

1. Atanasova, Y., Senn, C., (2011). Global customer team design: dimension, determanants, and performance outcomes. *Ind. Mark. Mang.* 40(2), 278-289.
2. Balkundi, P., & Harrison, D. A. (2006). Ties, leaders, and time in teams: Strong inference about network structure's effects on team viability and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 49–68.
3. Carron, A. V., Brawley, L. R., & Widmeyer, W. N. (1998) The measurement of cohesiveness in sport groups. In J. Duda (Ed.), *Advances in Sport and Exercise Psychology Measurement* (pp. 213–226). Fitness Information Technology, Morgantown, WV.
4. Choi, J.N. (2009). Collective dynamics of citizenship behavior: What group characteristics promote group-level helping?. *Journal of Management Studies* 46(8), 1396-1420.
5. Cholpassorn Sitthiwarongchai and Viroj Jadesadalug. (2016). Change in Organization Effecting to Work Efficiency and Satisfaction through Conflict in Organization. 8th World Conference on Educational Sciences, (WCES-2016), 04-06 February 2016, University of Alcalá, Madrid Spain.
6. Collins, C. J., & Smith, K. G. (2006) Knowledge exchange and combination: The role of human resource practices in the performance of high-technology firms. *Academy of Management Journal* 49(3), 544–560.
7. Deeter-Schmelz, D. R., & Ramsey, R. (1995). A conceptualization of the functions and roles of formalized selling and buying teams. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management.*, 15, 47–62.
8. Espinosa, J. A., Slaughter, S. A., Kraut, R. E., & Herbsleb, J. D. (2007). Familiarity, complexity, and team performance in geographically distributed software development. *Organization Science*, 18, 613–630.
9. Evans, W. R., & Charles, M. C. (2005) A social capital explanation of the relationship between functional diversity and group performance. *Team Performance Management* 11, 302–315.
10. Farh, J., Zhong. C., & Organ, D. (2004). Organization citizenship behavior in the people's republic of China. *Organization Science* 15(2). 241-253.
11. Goldberg, L. R. (1999) A broad-bandwidth, public-domain, personality inventory measuring the low-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in Europe* (Vol. 7, pp. 7–28). Tilburg University Press, Tilburg, The Netherlands.

12. Hoegl, M., & Proserpio, L. (2004) Team member proximity and teamwork in innovative projects. *Research Policy* 33, 1153–1165.
13. Homan, A.C., Hollenbeck, J.R., Humphrey, S.E., Van Knippenberg, D., Ilgen, D.R., & Van Kleef, G.A. (2008). Facing differences with an open mind: Openness to experience, salience of intra-group differences, and performance of diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51, 1204-1222.
14. Keller, R.T. (2001). Cross-Functional project groups in research and new product development: Diversity, communications, job stress, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(3), 547-555.
15. Kratzer, J., Leenders, R., & Van Engelen, J. (2004) A delicate managerial challenge: How cooperation and integration affect the performance of NPD teams. *Team Performance Management* 10, 20–25.
16. Kurniawati, E. P., & MeilianaIntani, A. (2016). Effect analysis of the use of accounting information, managerial performance and employee performance Towards SMEs. *Journal of Administrative and Business Studies*, 2(3), 130-142.
16. Islam, M. A., Hossain, M. R., & Verpoest, I. (2015). A study of the effectiveness of management development program. *International Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 1(2), 62-69.
18. Liao, H., Chuang, A., & Joshi, A. (2008). Perceived deep-level dissimilarity: personality antecedents and impact on overall job attitude, helping, work withdrawal, and turnover. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process* 106 (2), 106-124.
19. Lovelace, K., Shapiro, D.L., & Weingart, L.R. (2001). Maximizing cross-functional new product team's innovativeness and constraint adherence: A conflict communications perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 779-793.
20. Moon, M., & Gupta, S. (1997). Examining the formation of selling centers: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 17(2), 31–42.
21. Mullen, B., & Copper, C. (1994) The relation between group cohesiveness and performance: An integration. *Psychological Bulletin* 115(2), 210–227.
22. Nemeth, C.J., & Staw, B.M. (1998). The tradeoffs of social control and innovation in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol.22, pp. 175-210). Academic Press, New York.
23. Organ, D.W., (1988). *Organization Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
24. Podsakoff, P.M., Mckenzie, S.B., Lee, J.Y., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5). 879-903.
25. Schaubroeck, J., & Lam, S. K. S. (2002) How similarity to peers and supervisor influences organizational advancement in different cultures. *Academy of Management Journal* 45(6), 1120–1136.
26. Yu, K. Y. T., & Cable, D. M. (2011) Unpacking cooperation in diverse teams: Incorporating long-term orientation and civic virtue in the study of informational diversity. *Team Performance Management* 17, 63–82.
27. Van Dijk, H., Van Engen, M. L., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2012). Defying conventional wisdom: A meta-analytical examination of the differences between demographic and job-related diversity relationships with performance. *Organization behavior and Human decision processes*. 119. 38-53.
28. Van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C.K.W., & Homan, A.C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1008-1022.
29. Van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. C. (2007) Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology* 58, 515–541.
30. Wagner, J.A. (1995). Studies of individualism –collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management Journal* 38(1), 152-172.
31. Williams, K.Y., & O'Reilly, C.A.I. (1998). Demography and diversity organizations: A review of 40 years of research. Inbe. Staw & R. Sutton (Eds.). *Research organizational behavior* (vol.20, pp77-140). Greenwich, CT: JAJ Press.
32. Wong, S. (2004). Distal and local group learning: Performance trade – offs and tensions. *Organization Science*, 15(6), 645 – 656.