

TEAM STRUCTURE AND WORK-TEAM EFFECTIVENESS OF DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS IN NIGERIA

Tende, F. Buradum¹, Omiete, Fineface A.²

^{1,2} Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt,

Abstract: This study sought to examine the relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness of deposit money banks in Rivers State, Nigeria. The cross sectional survey method and quasi-experimental design were used alongside three null hypotheses to under-study forty-five randomly selected work-teams in systematically important banks (SIBs) in Rivers State using a research questionnaire. The Kendal's tau statistical technique was used with the aid of SPSS version 22, which aided our inference.

Key Words: Team Structure, Work-Team Effectiveness, and Deposit Money Banks.

1. INTRODUCTION:

Organizations don't seem to get the level of effectiveness they require from teams. Often than not, the reason for this may not be unconnected to the failure of leaders to tap into diverse potentials of work-teams that is positively generated through coordinated effort. Unlike workgroups, that share information, demonstrates neutral/negative, individual, and random disposition; work-teams tend to demonstrate collective effectiveness, positive, mutual, and complementary disposition (Robbins, Judge&Vehra, 2013).

Within the framework of work organizations, "team" is used to represent to a group of individuals organized around an independent set of tasks, who share responsibility for achieving particular outcomes (Guzzo& Dickson, 1996). Similarly, a team is a small sum of individuals with matching skills, who are dedicated to a common resolution, set of effectiveness objectives, and method for which they hold themselves mutually answerable (Katzenbach& Smith, 1993).

Work-team therefore, is a group arrangement within a business organization whose collective efforts result in success that is greater than the sum of the co-player inputs, geared towards attaining effectiveness (Robbins, Judge &Vehra, 2013). Building work-teams requires a leader to follow systematic planning and implementation processes to assess whether his/her team can improve the organization's goal attainment, remove barriers to team building, and build an effective team through training, empowerment, and feedback because effective teams advance robust devotion to structure the accomplishment of its purpose.

Team structure has been identified by empirical results as a evolving a team climate of conviction, confidence, sincerity, vision and common objectives, team collaboration, and cohesiveness (Tannenbaum, Beard, & Salas, 1992), and influence to perform well and attain its goals. Team structures have become very popular in contemporary workplace as (a), they are way to use employee talent (b), they are more flexible and responsive to the changing events than traditional units, and (c) they are a way to motivate employee through involvement in making quality decisions.

However, while there is ample literature on the relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness respectively (Mahabeer&Govender, 2013; Wu & Chen, 2014), there seems to be scanty scholarly research examining the relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness, specifically in the Nigerian banking sector. This is quite unfortunate as the meaning of work-team effectiveness in the health of deposit money banks cannot be overstated. Based on this observation, this study is set to fill this void by examining the influence of team structure on work-team effectiveness of deposit money banks in Rivers State, Nigeria.

Nevertheless, work-team effectiveness especially in deposit money banks particularly in Rivers State does not really come that easy because the technical process of developing team is difficult and demanding. Nurick (1993) holds that gaining work-team effectiveness is subject to several phenomena linked with group dynamics; namely, dissimilar point of view e.g. tendency to stereotype and devalue other peoples viewpoint, role conflict e.g. team members not knowing their boundaries especially as it concerns group task, implicit power struggle because horizontal and vertical authorities are represented in the team, and groupthink being a detriment to decision-making process in the group.

In an endeavor to address the glitches with work-team effectiveness, this work tends to look at ideal means in which proper team structure can be put to play, and what factors are necessary for effective team structure management to succeed and aid the work-team effectiveness of deposit money banks in Rivers State, Nigeria.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:

The theoretical foundation for work-team effectiveness is based on theory Y.

Theory Y

Theory Y is a theory of human motivation, developed by McGregor (1960). Here, leaders act in the belief that individuals that make up the workforce or team are motivated internally, and are emotionally attached to the task, duties, and responsibilities they are given. Employees that fall within this range are seen as being valuable assets and truly drive the internal workings of the firm (Sahin, 2012). In that the employees require little or no supervision in their attempt to create high quality output.

In line with the above, leaders that are seeming to be within this frame tend to be democratic and freely interact with their subordinates; allowing them to design, construct, publish their work in an appropriate manner in line with workload and project. In essence, drawing from the line of work-team effectiveness, theory Y does give the impression of natural feeling towards work, capable of self-direction, seek responsibility, and can make quality decision (Sahin, 2012).

3. CONCEPT OF TEAM STRUCTURE:

Jackson (1996) supposed that a team's structures are institutionalized operational activities that serve as structural variables such as regularity of team assemblies. Team assemblies establish the rudimentary requirements for teamwork (McGrath, 1991) because teammates are driven towards the team's assignment and hence subscribe to the team's goal realization (Tagiuri, 1995).

It was revealed that heterogeneity might affect amount of information exchange within the teams, because teammates with different structural roles possess different skills and expertise and, hence, comprehensive informational resources and knowledge (West, 1990). Heterogeneous teams do not carry only diverse knowledge and information but also different expressions, rational patterns, and styles (West, 1990) hence, as the team sources widely of information, the diverse perspectives will seemingly proliferate team learning and effectiveness.

There are several types of teams. The choice of type depends on the task to be accomplished, the organizational context and the resources available. For the purpose of this work however, only the functional team and project team was adopted.

3.1 Functional Teams

Functional teams are empowered teams that are made up of a collection of highly-trained, self-directed workers who have either accepted or discovered as a team all the responsibilities and tasks necessary to complete a specific project. Schermerhorn, Hunt and Osborn (2003) they replace the traditional work-team headed by a supervisor and the team members assume duties otherwise performed by a manager or first-line supervisor. Functional team is all about acting independently and work collaboratively. Functional team is self-directed and in contrast to boss-directed management (Elmuti, 1997).

Graaf, Korja, and Karjalainen (2009) found that when a team recruit a new member from a certain well-designed area in an organization, collaboration increased intensely in that area. The team over time begins to take more obligation and the leader gives more away. The leader continues to coach and support the members of the team but also grows by becoming responsible for more teams (Elmuti, 1997).

3.2 Project Teams

The creation of project teams around key value-adding processes is an increasingly common organizational response to pressures from increased competition (Cohen & Bailey, 1997). In this regard, firms hope to answer to the challenges of the environment, which were difficult or dreadful to manage with the existing structures, and also to develop the combined effect and synchronization in the value chain (Dinca & Voinescu, 2012).

The way out of amplified competition in a challenging environment is the project norm, whose application helps enterprises to get flexibility in their actions and fastness in their responses (Tannenbaum, Beard, & Salas, 1992). The more a firm develops its employees' skills and knowledge, the bigger their capability to cope with the market is. So, there is a direct relation between project teams, effectiveness and team work (Richard, 2009).

A project team is a team designed by the act of three individuals from different functional bodies working together to reach a shared goal. These players have got numerous practical skills and experiences, and they come from diverse units within the business (Ryback, 1998). Project team may be well-thought-out bridges to accomplishment as it aids the overall effectiveness of the employees because the whole is more effective than the sum of parts (Tagiuri, 1995).

4. CONCEPT OF WORK-TEAM EFFECTIVENESS:

The extent to which high effectiveness and individual achievement are valued is called effectiveness orientation. Related values and attributes include hard work, responsibility. Competitiveness, persistence, initiative, pragmatism, and acquisition of new skills in societies with strong effectiveness orientation values, results are emphasized more than people. What you do is more imperative than whom you are and individual achievements can be an important source of status and self-esteem. Relevant behaviours for team leaders also include planning and

arrangement the work to improve coordination, monitoring operations to detect problems that need to be resolved, and facilitating the work obtaining necessary resources and information.

Organizations that are considering a move towards work-team effectiveness will do well to define the scope of the work being handed to a specific team. A process of delegation can be beneficial to build the self-efficacy of a team. This process can allow the team to grow slowly and gather more accountability and authority as it delivers on each project. Without this continuum, some teams will fail only because they were given too much too soon. This gives the leader a clear role and the work-team effectiveness a clear field to play within.

4.1 Cohesiveness and Collaboration

First, cohesiveness connotes the point to which co-players of a team desire to remain in the team, showing attractiveness of the team to the individual (Evans & Dion, 1991; Tannenbaum, Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 1996). Although cohesiveness may begin to advance in the early stages of a team, at the working stage it grows into a key facilitative component of the team process. Establishing cohesiveness in the initial stages may be connected to the ability of members to deal with conflict that often comes during the working stage (Tannenbaum, Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 1996).

Secondly, collaboration is a long-term disposition demonstrated by work-teams, and seen in specific role, responsibilities, accountability, and coordinated decision-making taken. This gives room for a consensus in agreement in the pooled resources (Parkinson, 2006). It is pertinent to note that collaboration represents joint efforts between dissimilar entities in a work-team which enhances “work-team emphasis” in unifying and consolidating processes, cultivating communications ties through mutual exploration within and between individuals coming from different departments (or units) in a bid to achieving the desired goal (Parkinson, 2006).

5. TEAM STRUCTURE AND WORK-TEAM EFFECTIVENESS:

For conducting an analysis of the influence of TS on work-team effectiveness; because of the task integration the employees have increased autonomy and job control and are able to make greater use of their skills and problem-solving capabilities. Given the same level of inputs, if errors and problems can be eliminated and work continues undeterred then the resultant output would be expected to be above that of a work system that had not been designed to attend these issues; hence the notion that teamwork improves effectiveness (Manz, Keating, & Donnellon, 1990). Effectiveness is generally measured in terms of output per unit of composite input (capital and labour).

A positive relation between teamwork and effectiveness was established several times in previous research. Manz, Keating and Donnellon (1990) report the results of a longitudinal field study in an electromechanical assembly plant, examining the impact of work teams on manufacturing effectiveness. Their regression results showed a significant improvement in labour effectiveness in the months following the formation of high effectiveness work teams.

6. Leadership climate as a moderator of the relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness:

Leadership behaviours or tone set are primarily in terms of two broadly defined categories namely consideration and initiating structure (Chen & Barnes, 2006). Chen and Barnes (2006) revealed that the two types of behaviour were relatively independent. Consideration is that category of behaviour which involves leader concern for people interpersonal relationships. The leader acts in a friendly and supportive manner and shows concern for the needs and feelings of subordinates (Useem, 1998). Initiating Structure on the other side is that category of behavior that involves leader concern for accomplishing the task. The leader defines and structures his or her role and the roles of subordinates toward attainment of task goals (Useem, 1998; Chen & Barnes, 2006).

In order to understand leadership in teams, it is helpful to examine the collective processes that determine team effectiveness. Leaders can improve team effectiveness by influencing these processes in a positive way as several theories have proposed models of team effectiveness (Yukl, 2002). In a high-effectiveness orientation culture, the selection of members for a team with an important task is likely to be based on talent, not on friendship or family relations.

7. EMPIRICAL REVIEW:

Different scholars have differing views on the variables especially when verified with other variable. This is depicted in the table below:

S/No.	Author(s)	Year	Country	Construct/Topic	Method	Findings
1.	Mahabeer & Govender	2013	South Africa	Employee involvement: A tool for work team effectiveness.	Questionnaire, validity and reliability using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha.	Employee involvement significantly impact work team effectiveness in varying degrees.

					Descriptive and inferential statistics. Factor analysis with the aid of SPSS..	and employee involvement is an imperative tool for work team effectiveness.
2.	Wu & Chen	2014	Taiwan	A factor analysis on teamwork performance: An empirical study of inter-instituted collaboration.	SPSS, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM).	Knowledge-sharing created a positive effect on team performance. Team conflict caused a negative effect on team performance.

Table 1.

8. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES:

In order to answer the above research questions, the following hypotheses were stated in the null form:

H0₁: There is no significant relationship between functional team and cohesiveness and collaboration of deposit money banks in Rivers State.

H0₂: There is no significant relationship between project team and cohesiveness and collaboration of deposit money banks in Rivers State.

H0₃: Leadership climate does not significantly moderate the relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness of deposit money banks in Rivers State.

9. TEST OF HYPOTHESES:

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22 was used to analysis the data, using the Kendal’s tab statistical technique, a non-parametric statistical technique was deemed appropriate for analysis since the study involves ordinal data. Also, the study involves the analysis of correlation between two variables (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1982; Creswell, 2009). The results obtained are shown below:

H0₁: There is no significant relationship between functional team and cohesiveness, and collaboration in deposit money banks in Rivers State.

Table 2. Correlations between functional team and measures of work-team effectiveness

			Functional team	Cohesiveness	Collaboration
Functional team	Correlation Coefficient		1.000	.533**	.649**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.	.002	.001
	N		279	279	279
Kendall's tau_b	Correlation Coefficient	Cohesiveness	.533**	1.000	.208
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002	.	.001
	N		279	279	279
Collaboration	Correlation Coefficient	Collaboration	.649**	.208	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.008	.
	N		279	279	279

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 2.

The Kendall’s tab Correlation Coefficient statistical technique, a non-parametric technique was used in testing the relationship between these variables. The output as shown in table 4.1 reveals that functional team is significantly and positively correlated with cohesiveness and collaboration with a (tau = .533, p-value <.05 for cohesiveness), and (tau = .649, pv< .05 for collaboration). Therefore, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant relationship between functional team and cohesiveness, and collaboration was rejected while the alternative was accepted.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between project team and cohesiveness and collaboration in deposit money banks in Rivers State.

Table 3. Correlations between project team and measures of work-team effectiveness

		Project Team	Cohesiveness	Collaboration	
Kendall's tau_b	Project Team	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.431**	.543**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	279	279	279
	Cohesiveness	Correlation Coefficient	.431**	1.000	.222
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	279	279	279
	Collaboration	Correlation Coefficient	.543**	.222	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	279	279	279

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). Table 3.

Table 3.above shows that project team is positively and moderately associated with cohesiveness and collaboration with a (tau = .431, p-value <.05 for cohesiveness), and (tau = .543, pv< .05 for collaboration). Therefore, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant relationship between project team and cohesiveness, and collaboration was rejected while the alternative was accepted.

H₀₃: Leadership climate does not significantly moderate the relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness in deposit money banks in Rivers State.

Table 4.Moderating effect of leadership climate on the relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness.

Control variables			Team Structure	Work-Team Effectiveness	Leadership Climate
-none ^a	Team Structure	Correlation	1.000	.564	.574
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		Df	0	279	279
	Work-Team Effectiveness	Correlation	.564	1.000	.406
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		Df	279	0	279
	Leadership Climate	Correlation	.574	.406	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		Df	279	279	0
Leadership Climate	Team Structure	Correlation	1.000	.447	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	
		Df	0	273	
	Work-Team Effectiveness	Correlation	.447	1.000	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	
		Df	273	0	

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

Table 4.shows the result of the moderating effect of Leadership climate on the relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness. The section labeled none^a showed the result when there was no moderating effect.

The result showed that partial correlation (removing the effect) of Leadership climate on relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness was moderately positive (rho = .447, n = 273, p < .05), however, the zero

order correlation ($\rho = .764$) indicates that moderating for Leadership climate has a positive but moderate influence on the relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness. Therefore the hypothesis was rejected.

10. DISCUSSION:

The study examined the relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness in deposit money banks in Rivers State. Three hypotheses were formulated based on the elements of team structure and the measure of work-team effectiveness as well as leadership climate, which shows that there is a significant relationship existing between functional and project team and cohesiveness and collaboration. In essence, the dimensions had a significant relationship with our measures. When Leadership climate was also introduced, it proved to have a significant moderating effect on the variables which made us reject the stated null hypotheses.

This result is in line with the studies of Mahabeer and Govender (2013), which hold that employee involvement especially when structured in teams significantly impact on the sub-dimension(s) of work-team effectiveness in varying degrees, and employee involvement is an imperative for high work-team effectiveness.

11. CONCLUSION:

Deposit money banks in Rivers State, Nigeria can develop sound leadership for successful management of team structures to generate the desired level of work-team effectiveness. In specific terms, functional team has a significant relationship with cohesiveness and collaboration. Similarly, project team has a significant relationship with cohesiveness and collaboration. Lastly, leadership climate moderates the relationship between team structure and work-team effectiveness in deposit money banks in Rivers State, Nigeria.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS:

From the analysis and conclusions above, the following recommendations were made:

- Leadership of teams in deposit money banks should explore the diversity of experiences, expertise, and knowledge that comes with functional teams which will result in cohesiveness and collaboration of team members.
- Leadership of teams in deposit money banks may assign designated employees to undertake specific tasks; thereby making them cohesiveness and collaboration at all times.
- Leaders of various team structures in deposit money banks should create a climate that would help team leadership capitalizes on the strengths and minimizes the weaknesses of work-teams; in that way work-team effectiveness is enhanced.

REFERENCES

1. Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
2. Barney, J. B. (2001). Is the resource-based “view” a useful perspective for strategic management research? *Yes. Academy of Management Review*, 26, 41–56.
3. Carroll, B. (1996). The power of empowered teams: National effectiveness review. 15(4), 85-92.
4. Chen, L. Y., & Barnes, F. B. (2006). Leadership behaviors and knowledge sharing in professional service firms engaged in strategic alliances. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 11(2), 51-70.
5. Cohen, S. G., Bailey, D. E., (1997). What makes teams work: Team effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of Management*, 2, 239– 290.
6. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278-321.
7. Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc.
8. Dinca, L., & Voinescu, C., (2012). Project teams and their role in increasing competitiveness of the organizational partnerships. *EIRP Proceedings*, Galați, Romania, 453-459.
9. Elmuti, D. (1997). Self-managed work teams approach: Creative management tool or a fad? *Management decision*, 35(3), 233-239.
10. Graaf, D., Koria, M., Karjalainen, T., (2009). Modelling research into cross-functional team effectiveness. *Proceedings of the IASDR Conference*, Seoul, South Korea.
11. Hackman, J. R. (1984). A normative model of work-team effectiveness. *Yale School of Organization and Management*, New Haven, Conn., Research Program on Team Effectiveness, Technical Report, 2.
12. Ingram, H., & Desombre, T. (1999). Teamwork: Comparing academic and practitioners’ perceptions. *Team Effectiveness Management*, 5(1), 16-22.

13. Jackson, S. E. (1996). The consequences of diversity in multidisciplinary work Managers. In M. A. West (Ed.), *Handbook of work team psychology*. London: Wiley.
14. Kahane, A. (2004). *Solving Tough Problems: An open way of talking, listening, and creating new realities*. San Fransisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
15. Katzenbach, J. R. & Smith, D. K., (1993). *The discipline of teams*. Harvard Business Review, Boston, MA 02163.
16. Kothari, C. R. (2008). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Dehli: New Age International.
17. Mahabeer, M. & Govender, P. (2013). Employee involvement: A tool for work team effectiveness. *Corporate Ownership & Control* 10(2), 241
18. Manz, C. M., Keating, D. E., & Donnellon, A. (1990). Preparing for an organizational change to Employee Self-Management: The Managerial Transition. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19(2), 15-26.
19. McGrath, J. E. (1991). Time, interaction and effectiveness: A theory of teams. *Small Team Research*, 22, 147-174.
20. McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, McGrawHill
21. Nachmias, C. & Nachmias, D. (1982). *Research methods in social sciences*, London, Edward Arnold.
22. Nurick, A. J. (1993). Business: Business general. *Journal of Society for Advanced Management*, 0036-0805
23. Parkinson, C. (2006). *Building successful collaborations: A guide to collaboration among non-profit agencies and between non-profit agencies and businesses*. Cambridge & North Dumtries Community Foundation.
24. Richard, D. (2009): *Measuring organizational effectiveness: Towards methodological best practice*. *Journal of Management*.
25. Robbins, S.T., Judge, T.A. & Vohra, N. (2013). *Organizational behavior (15th ed.)*. Dorling Kindersley, Pearson, South Asia.
26. Ryback, D. (1998). *Leading functional teams: Putting emotional intelligence to work*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
27. Sahin, F. (2012). The mediating effect of leader-member exchange on the relationship between theory x and y management style and effective commitment: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 18(2), 159-174
28. Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (2003). *Self-managing teams*. *Organizational behavior*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
29. Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business (4th ed.)*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
30. Spector, P.E. (1997). *Effectiveness: Application, assessment, causes and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
31. Tagiuri, R. (1995). Using teams effectively. *Research Technology Management*, 38(1), 12–13.
32. Tannenbaum, S.I., Beard, R.L & Salas, E. (1992). Teambuilding and its influence on team effectiveness: An examination of conceptual and empirical developments. In Kelley, K. (ed.), *Issues, Theory and Research in Industrial/Organizational Psychology*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
33. Tuckman, B. W. & Jensen, M. A. C. (1977). Stages of team development revisited. *Team and Organizational Studies*, 2, 419-427
34. Useem, M. (1998). *The leadership moment*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
35. Vickberg, S. M. J. & Chrisfort, K. (2017). The new science of teamwork. *Harvard Business Review*, 51,
36. West, M. A. (1990). The social psychology of cohesiveness in teams. In M.A. West & J.L. Farr (Eds.), *Cohesiveness and creativity in work: Psychological and organizational strategies* London: Wiley.
37. Wu, M. & Chen, Y. (2014). A factor analysis on teamwork performance: An empirical study of inter-instituted collaboration. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 55, 37-54
38. Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.