

THE IMPACT OF COMMUNICATION AND GROUP DYNAMICS ON TEAMWORK EFFECTIVENESS: THE CASE OF SERVICE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS

Ashish Mohanty, Institute of Management & Information Science
Sasmita Mohanty, Siksha 'O' Anusandhan University

ABSTRACT

The present study makes an attempt to study the dynamics of teamwork effectiveness, communication and group dynamics across private banks, hotels and retail sector and to ascertain the relative importance of communication and group dynamics in determining teamwork effectiveness in banks, hotels and retail sector. Three standardized questionnaires namely Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire, Group Functioning Questionnaire and Team Effectiveness Assessment Measure Questionnaire have been used to collect the data. The sample size is two hundred and ninety seven from private banks, hotels and retail chains in Bhubaneswar city, Odisha. The statistical tools used are descriptive analysis, Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) and Multiple Regression Analysis to analyse the data and interpret the results. Based on the findings, organisational development and intervention strategies are suggested to enhance teamwork effectiveness in the service sector.

Keywords: Communication, Group Dynamics, Teamwork, Service Sector.

INTRODUCTION

The organisation's success depends upon the members of the team involved in the development process (Verburg et al., 2013). Members belonging to different teams within the organizational structure are truly the flag bearers and the assets of an organization. Today, a large number of the workforce is engaged in jobs that involve more customer interaction and a certain amount of skills and effective communication to carry out their jobs because of the dynamic nature of business. Under such a scenario, employees feel the need for information both internal as well as external to be confident and comfortable at workplace.

Communication is the lifeline of any organisation and the success of a business enterprise to a great extent depends upon the efficient and effective communication (Bisen & Priya, 2008). Hynes opined that "*management communication is both challenging and exciting as managers communicated with subordinates in quite different ways in the past than they do today in the 21st century*".

Organisations often deal with groups of people who have to perform some job which involves multifarious tasks in which they often work in teams (Forsyth, 2010). Complex and complicated processes encompassing enumerable tasks cannot be executed and carried out by an individual, rather, the solution is to have a team of individuals who can perform the similar tasks and work in shortest possible time (Patel et al., 2010). Hence, the importance of communication cannot be over emphasized, demanding the interdependencies within the group (Cherry & Robillard, 2008). Lewin rightly called the processes of how groups and individuals act and react

to changing circumstances as group dynamics (Patel et al., 2010) that considers different aspects of group members' interaction. This is especially true for service sector organisations. The increasing trends in specialization and division of labour in service sector calls for effective communication and group dynamics for overall organizational goal achievement. Interpersonal communication, group dynamics and teamwork is vital in any service sector organization where the services are rendered based upon the intangibility aspect i.e., the interpersonal communication.

Communication is not just providing information only (Zhu et al., 2004). In fact, it plays a major role as far as the success and failure of any organization is concerned (Orpen, 1997). The goals and objectives of an organization are attained by motivating the employees through effective organizational communication (Clampitt & Downs, 1993). According to (Communicationtheory.org, 2010), communication in organizations occur at three levels viz., primary, interpersonal, between groups and at an organizational level and also takes place in three major forms, verbal, non-verbal and written (Ober, 2001). Similarly, the direction and flow of communication may be top-down, bottom-up and horizontal or lateral depending upon the hierarchical structure within the organisation (Postmes, 2003). The downward communication is about supervisor to subordinate communication whereas upward communication involves communication from subordinate to supervisor and horizontal or lateral communication is about the communication amongst the peer group. Communication among different departments is referred as cross-channel communication (Ober, 2001).

The use of groups or teams in organisations is considered an effective response to the dynamic and competitive environments in which organisations operate (Lira et al., 2008). In consideration of the impact of groups on organisational outcomes, organisations are now devoting more time, attention and resources towards research on groups with a strong focus on group performance (Chou & Garcia, 2011) and are becoming more dependent on groups due to the shift towards a flatter and more decentralized organisational structure (Krebs et al., 2006).

Lewin (1943) explained about the way small groups and individuals act and react to different circumstances which he called as "*group dynamics*". Lind & Skärvad (1997) while explaining about a "*team*" and a "*group*" said that "*a team is a special type of group, because apart from the fact that they interact with each other, they also work together whereas a team has a common goal, they are integrated, engaged and they have complementing competencies*". This theory is also supported by Lewén & Philip (1998).

In today's every dynamic and evolving business environment, teams have become the mainstay of any service sector organisations. And, it's all about working with coworkers and team members, toward growth and success of the company (Welbourne et al., 1998). Thus, the emphasis on team role in various work performance models has warranted a change in the way the organisations perform (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Campbell, 1990). Consequently, an employee's work effectiveness depends upon his or her ability to manage the team towards teamwork effectiveness. Teamwork is defined by Scarnati (2001) "*as a cooperative process that allows ordinary people to achieve extraordinary results*".

Teamwork is increasingly becoming a prerequisite for many job functions in those learning organizations striving towards quality. In this regard, Guzzo & Dickson (1996) argue that team-based forms of organising often bring about higher levels of organisational effectiveness in comparison to traditional, bureaucratic forms. However, there is a daunting task for many managers to create a teamwork environment in organizations from service sector.

The research on teamwork is either limited or there are a few studies carried out in service delivery organisations. For example, it has focused on areas such as healthcare, where teams are multi-disciplinary with issues such as collegiality, hierarchy and professionalism (Finn et al., 2010; Lloyd & Newell, 2000). Similarly, World Tourism Organization maintains that hotels and catering which is the world's largest industry, there is limited empirical research in particular on teamwork (Salanova et al., 2005).

Hospitality industry, banking & retail sector seem intuitively to depend heavily upon effective teamwork. Although a lot of studies have been conducted to understand group dynamics (Janis, 1982; Hoyt & Blascovich, 2003), predict group performance (Kolschoten et al., 2011; Kelly et al., 2011; Bushe & Coetzer, 2007) and improve the quality of group activities (Shapiro et al., 2001; Spring & Vathanophas, 2003) and a number of studies on subgroups in teamwork (Ocker et al., 2011; Carton & Cummings, 2012), there are a few articles or research studies on teamwork in service sector settings and moreover there has been no research undertaken taking all the three concepts namely communication, group dynamics and effective teamwork in their studies, especially in service sector.

Therefore, in order to find out to what extent these factors will have any such effects in the service sector within the Odisha context and in particular the private banks, hotels and retail chains in the city of Bhubaneswar, the researchers felt that there is need to investigate and document the above mentioned factors affecting teamwork effectiveness in these service sector organisations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Miller et al. (2018) conducted a systematic review in PubMed and Embase to identify team-building interventions. The evaluated outcomes in four domains were trainee evaluations, teamwork attitudes/knowledge, and team functioning and patient impact. The team-building interventions were generally positive while evaluating trainees, but, only one study associated team-building with statistically significant improvement in teamwork attitudes/knowledge.

Sanyal & Hisam (2018) carried out a study to analyse the impact of teamwork on the employees of Dhofar University. The results reveal that there is a strong and significant connection between the independent variables viz. teamwork, climate of trust, leadership and structure, performance evaluation and rewards and the performance of the employees of the university.

McEwan et al. (2017) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of teamwork interventions that were carried out with the purpose of improving teamwork and team performance, using controlled experimental designs. Positive and significant medium-sized effects were found for teamwork interventions on both teamwork and team performance.

Salman & Hassan (2016) carried out a study on impact of effective teamwork on employee performance in an entertainment company in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. All the chosen factors such as communication, level of trust, leadership and accountability had a positive and significant impact on employee performance.

Monga et al. (2015) conducted a study on Job Satisfaction of Employees of ICICI Bank in Himachal Pradesh. The study revealed that inter-personal relationship, communication, attitude of superiors, working conditions and team work are important than any other factors in determining job satisfaction of employees.

Chitrao (2014) conducted a study on retail organizations' internal communication systems. The study revealed that all employees prefer face-to-face interaction and that interpersonal communication remains important at all levels the organization.

Wright et al. (2014) found out that interdependence is often regarded as a structural precursor to conflict.

Rahim & Tuli (2013) conducted a comparative study on effectiveness of communication practices with customers between Eastern Bank Ltd. and Mutual Trust Bank Ltd., Bangladesh. The findings suggest that employees of both the banks communicate regularly with the customers on a daily basis.

Saurabh and Chattopadhyay conducted a research to understand and assess the impact of communication credibility on the communication satisfaction among private banking professionals. The results revealed a significant impact of communication credibility on communication satisfaction.

Nischal (2013) opined that conflict, is but natural and it is difficult to visualize the attainment of social and personal goals and without it.

Mughal & Khan (2013) conducted a survey on eight corporate sector organizations in Pakistan. The results showed that the two most commonly faced conflict types are intra-personal and inter-personal conflicts.

Arulrajah & Opatha (2013) in their study sought to explain team working practices and explore the level of team orientation of both state and private bank employees and investigate the differences in team orientation of employees. Findings from the study revealed that various team working practices are present in both the state and the private banks.

Pfeffer (2013) is of the opinion that "*decisions to be made in cross-functional work groups are rarely clear and are often multifaceted and have a multiple ways of evaluation*".

Kelchner (2013) points out that in order to increase diversity within a team, it is important to allow various skills sets and ideas to amalgamate to achieve the best possible solution.

Akintayo & Faniran (2012) conducted a study on the impact of group dynamics in terms of communication skills and interpersonal relationship on workers' level of social interaction and organisational goal achievement. The study revealed that there was a significant relationship between communication skills and the level of social interaction among the workforce.

Etta & James (2012) found out that laissez-faire and avoidance conflict management can prove detrimental to retail organizations.

Whetten & Cameron (2011) pointed out the factors that contribute toward effective team performance are: a heterogeneous team composition; familiarity among team members; team motivation; team competence; team goals and overall feedback; cohesion among team members; and, decision-making processes within the team.

Kaifi & Noorie (2011) conducted a study on communication skills and team outcomes between managers and employees. The study revealed that female managers had higher scores on communicating with employees since their scores were significantly higher than the males.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To study the concept of communication, group dynamics and teamwork.
2. To study the difference that exists between bank, hotel and retail sector in respect of teamwork effectiveness, communication and group dynamics.

3. To study the impact of communication and group dynamics on teamwork effectiveness in bank, hotel and retail sector.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

H₁: There is a significant impact of banks, hotel and retail chains on teamwork effectiveness.

H₂: Teamwork effectiveness is high in banking Sector.

H₃: Communication is more effective in banking sector.

H₄: Group dynamics is more effective in hotel sector.

METHOD OF STUDY

Data Collection

Data were collected both from primary and secondary source. In order to collect data from primary source, tested questionnaires were used. Three tools, namely, Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire by Downs & Hazen, Group Functioning Questionnaire Robbins Bleeker and Team Effectiveness Assessment Measure Questionnaire by Udai Pareek have been used to measure the different variables. Whereas, the secondary data were collected from websites of different banks, hotels and retail chains, annual reports, journals, etc.

Procedure

Data was collected through purposive sampling as per the design of the study. The survey was conducted to the sample of two hundred and ninety seven respondents (297) selected among the employees drawn across various levels from hotels, private banks and retail chains of Bhubaneswar city. All the three questionnaires together were given to the respondents. Instruction was given by the investigator to all the respondents regarding the method to be adopted for recording their response. The doubts were cleared by the investigator. The respondents were requested to take the survey as they were made to understand that the data collected will be used for doctoral research purpose only and information will be kept confidential. Each statement on the survey using “*Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire*” was measured using a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from 1-very dissatisfied to 7-very satisfied. Each statement on the survey using “*Group Functioning Questionnaire*” was measured using a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree while each statement on the survey using “*Team Effectiveness Assessment Measurement Questionnaire*” was measure using 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 0-not all true about the group and 4-highly characteristic of the group. The filled in questionnaires were collected and based on the data, the data sheets were prepared. Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was used to analyse the data as per the objectives and the tests like Descriptive Analysis, one-way ANOVA Test and Multiple Regression Analysis were applied to ascertain the result of variation.

Data Analysis

Sample across sector

A sample of 338 was originally identified and out of these a sample of 297 was used for testing the hypotheses. The survey process was conducted in five banks (99 respondents), six hotels (98 respondents) and four retail chains (100 respondents) in the city of Bhubaneswar (Table 1).

Sector	Number	Percentage
Bank	99	33.33
Hotel	98	33.00
Retail	100	33.67
Total	297	100.00

Descriptive Analysis

Determinants under Study	Banks		Hotels		Retail Chains	
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D
V1-Teamwork	68.62	9.34	63.58	4.28	62.14	3.90
V2-Information Dimension	79.29	4.16	71.58	9.96	62.04	13.16
V3-Relational Dimension	36.09	1.99	32.02	5.96	30.16	4.98
V4-Information/relational dimension	86.67	4.30	69.97	9.57	55.88	9.14
V5-Communication	202.06	7.94	173.58	23.33	148.08	18.15
V6-Group Loyalty	39.94	4.63	38.56	3.90	34.94	6.36
V7-Group Conflict	19.29	5.85	26.52	5.91	30.11	4.94
V8-Group Readiness for Work	43.32	3.68	41.45	3.74	42.16	3.75
V9-Group Work	42.50	3.31	42.15	3.80	37.18	6.19
V10-Group Termination	30.21	4.31	31.84	3.14	32.52	2.75
V11-Group Dynamics	175.28	11.7	180.54	12.08	176.91	13.92

Analysis of Variance

Determinants under Study	Sectors under Study	Sum of Squares	df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
V1 Teamwork	Between Groups	2290.105	2	1145.052	28.400	0.000
	Within Groups	11853.532	294	40.318		
	Total	14143.636	296			
V2 Information Dimension	Between Groups	14868.717	2	7434.359	76.734	0.000
	Within Groups	28484.192	294	96.885		

	Total	43352.909	296			
V3 Relational Dimension	Between Groups	1827.981	2	913.991	42.642	0.000
	Within Groups	6301.581	294	21.434		
	Total	8129.562	296			
V4 Information/Relational Dimension	Between Groups	47281.703	2	23640.852	366.000	0.000
	Within Groups	18990.176	294	64.592		
	Total	66271.879	296			
V5 Communication	Between Groups	145083.365	2	72541.683	232.747	0.000
	Within Groups	91632.843	294	311.676		
	Total	236716.209	296			
V6 Group Loyalty	Between Groups	1332.153	2	666.077	25.778	.000
	Within Groups	7596.520	294	25.839		
	Total	8928.673	296			
V7 Group Conflict	Between Groups	6031.859	2	3015.929	96.623	.000
	Within Groups	9176.754	294	31.213		
	Total	15208.613	296			
V8 Group Readiness for Work	Between Groups	174.816	2	87.408	6.278	.002
	Within Groups	4093.433	294	13.923		
	Total	4268.249	296			
V9 Group Work	Between Groups	1765.304	2	882.652	41.294	.000
	Within Groups	6284.212	294	21.375		
	Total	8049.515	296			
V10 Group Termination	Between Groups	279.797	2	139.899	11.651	.000
	Within Groups	3530.210	294	12.008		
	Total	3810.007	296			
V11 Group Dynamics	Between Groups	1426.362	2	713.181	4.474	.012
	Within Groups	46868.608	294	159.417		
	Total	48294.970	296			
	Total	70.471	296			

Table 2 gives the average mean difference of three service organizations under study (banks, hotels & retail chains) on the dimensions of communication, group dynamics and teamwork. In determining the relationship between the organizations under study and dimensions of communication and group dynamics, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed (Table 3). The results shows that the impact of service sector (banks, hotels and retail chains) is significant on teamwork effectiveness in service sector where $F(2, 294)=28.40$, $P=0.00$ at 0.05 level, which implies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted with 95% confidence level. The mean score shows that banks are more effective than hotels and retail chains ($M=68.62, 63.58$ & 62.14 respectively).

Further, the result shows that banks, hotels and retail chains do differ on communication satisfaction. There is a significant difference between banks, hotels and retail chains on communication satisfaction where $F(2, 294)=232.74$, $P=0.00$ at 0.05 level, which implies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted with 95% confidence level. The mean score in shows that banks' communication satisfaction is better than that of hotels and retail outlets ($M=202.06, 173.58$ & 148.08). Moreover, comparisons have been done between banks, hotels and retail outlets on different dimensions of communication satisfaction like information dimension (media quality, organisational integration & organisational perspective), relational dimension (subordinate communication & informal communication) and information/relational dimension (personal feedback, superior communication & communication climate). It is found that banks are high on information dimension than hotels and retail chains ($M=79.29, 71.58$ & 62.04 respectively). There is a significant difference between banks, hotels

and retail chains on information dimension of communication satisfaction where $F(2, 294)=76.73$, $P=0.00$ at 0.05 level, which implies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted with 95% confidence level. It is found that banks are high on relational dimension when compared to hotels and retail chains ($M=36.09$, 32.02 & 30.16 respectively). There is a significant difference between banks, hotels and retail chains on relational dimension of communication satisfaction where $F(2, 294)=42.64$, $P=0.00$ at 0.05 level, which implies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted with 95% confidence level. Similarly, in case of information/relational dimension i.e., a dimension of communication satisfaction where $F(2, 294)=366.00$, $P=0.00$. The result shows that the impact of sectors (banks, hotels and retail chains) is significant at 0.05 level ($p<0.05$), which means that in terms of information/relational dimension, banks, hotels and retail chains do differ. The mean score shows that the employees of banks have recorded more information/relational dimension in comparison to hotels and retail chains ($M=86.67$, 69.97 & 55.38 respectively).

Comparing all the variables of group dynamics, it is found that there is significant difference in terms of group dynamics in practice between banks, hotels and retail chains in Bhubaneswar, Odisha. The result shows that it is significant where $F(2, 294)=4.47$, $P=0.012$, which implies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted with 95% confidence level. On comparison of the means, it has been identified that the hotels have better group dynamics in comparison to retail chains & banks ($M=180.54$, 176.91 & 175.28 respectively).

Moreover, comparisons have been done between banks, hotels and retail chains on different dimensions of group dynamics viz., group loyalty, group conflict, group readiness for work, group work and group termination. It is found that banks have recorded higher in terms of group loyalty when compared to hotels and retail chains in Bhubaneswar, Odisha ($M=39.94$, 38.56 & 34.94 respectively). There is a significant difference between banks, hotels and retail chains on group loyalty, a dimension of group dynamics where $F(2, 294)=25.77$, $P=0.00$ at 0.05 level, which implies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted with 95% confidence level. When it comes to group conflict, it is found that the retail chains have higher conflict than hotels and banks ($M=30.11$, 26.52 & 19.29 respectively). There is a significant difference between banks, hotels and retail chains on group conflict, a dimension of group dynamics where $F(2, 294)=96.62$, $P=0.00$ at 0.05 level, which implies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted with 95% confidence level. Similarly, in case of group readiness for work, i.e., a dimension of group dynamics, the result shows that the impact of sectors (banks, hotels and retail chains) is significant where $F(2, 294)=6.27$, $P=0.00$ at 0.05 level, which means that in terms of group readiness for work, banks, hotels and retail chains do differ. The mean score shows that the employees of banks have recorded more in group readiness for work in comparison to hotels and retail chains ($M=43.32$, 41.45 & 42.16 respectively). It is found that the banks have higher mean score when it comes to group work in comparison to hotels and retail chains (42.50 , 42.15 & 37.18 respectively). There is a significant difference between banks, hotels and retail chains on group work, a dimension of group dynamics where $F(2, 294)=41.29$, $P=0.00$ at 0.05 level, which implies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted with 95% confidence level. Similarly, in case of group termination, a dimension of group dynamics, retail chains have recorded higher score when compared to hotels and banks ($M=32.52$, 31.84 & 30.21 respectively). There is a significant difference between banks, hotels and retail chains on group

termination, one of the dimensions of group dynamics where $F(2, 294)=11.65, P=0.00$ at 0.05 level, which implies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted with 95% confidence level. Thus, it is observed from the above test results of one way ANOVA that the relationship is statistically significant in case of all the dimensions of communication & group dynamics and teamwork.

Table 4
RESULTS OF MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF ALL THE DIMENSIONS OF COMMUNICATION AND GROUP DYNAMICS FOR PREDICTING TEAMWORK EFFECTIVENESS BASED ON THE TOTAL SAMPLE

Variable	Regression Coefficient	t	P	R	R Square
Information Dimension (V2)	0.635	3.230	<0.05	0.862	0.743
Relational Dimension (V3)	0.593	3.815	<0.05		
Information/relational dimension (V4)	0.687	3.433	<0.05		
Group Loyalty (V6)	0.623	2.907	<0.05		
Group Conflict (V7)	-0.615	-1.275	<0.05		
Group Readiness for Work (V8)	0.773	2.408	<0.05		
Group Work (V9)	0.781	2.435	<0.05		
Group Termination (V10)	0.421	1.909	<0.05		
Analysis of Variance					
Source	SS	df.	Mean Square	F	P
Regression	1216.99	8	152.124	2.637	0.000
Residual	16614.72	288	57.690		
Total	17831.71	296			

The above findings in Table 4 reveal that information dimension, relational dimension, information/relational dimension, group loyalty, group conflict, group readiness for work, group work and group termination are the most important predictors of teamwork effectiveness. These 8 variables yielded a multiple R of 0.862 explaining 74.3% of variance in teamwork effectiveness. For the entire sample, the major contribution comes from information dimension, information/relational dimension, group loyalty, group readiness for work and group work.

Table 5
RESULTS OF MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF ALL THE DIMENSIONS OF COMMUNICATION AND GROUP DYNAMICS FOR PREDICTING TEAMWORK EFFECTIVENESS OF BANKS

Variable	Regression Coefficient	t	P	R	R Square
Information Dimension (V2)	0.786	4.266	<0.05	0.951	0.904
Relational Dimension (V3)	0.823	5.786	<0.05		
Information/relational dimension (V4)	0.809	4.632	<0.05		
Group Loyalty (V6)	0.383	3.574	<0.05		
Group Conflict (V7)	-0.462	-4.534	<0.05		
Group Readiness for Work (V8)	0.509	4.990	<0.05		
Group Work (V9)	0.514	4.659	<0.05		
Group Termination (V10)	0.373	3.289	<0.05		
Analysis of Variance					
Source	SS	df.	Mean Square	F	P
Regression	433.784	8	54.223	3.414	0.001
Residual	1429.38	90	15.882		

Total	1863.164	98			
--------------	----------	----	--	--	--

The above findings in Table 5 in case of Banks revealed that the 8 variables yielded a multiple R of 0.951 explaining 90.4% of the variance in teamwork effectiveness in banks. The multiple regression analysis revealed that the major contribution comes from information dimension, relational dimension, information/relational dimension, group readiness for work and group work. The overall picture suggests that the communication satisfaction level among the employees in banks is high.

Table 6
RESULTS OF MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF ALL THE DIMENSIONS OF COMMUNICATION AND GROUP DYNAMICS FOR PREDICTING TEAMWORK EFFECTIVENESS OF HOTELS

Variable	Regression Coefficient	t	P	R	R Square
Information Dimension (V2)	0.549	3.828	<0.05	0.845	0.714
Relational Dimension(V3)	0.591	3.984	<0.05		
Information/relational dimension (V4)	0.409	3.529	<0.05		
Group Loyalty (V6)	0.369	2.440	<0.05		
Group Conflict (V7)	-0.542	-3.714	<0.05		
Group Readiness for Work (V8)	0.720	5.843	<0.05		
Group Work (V9)	0.737	6.193	<0.05		
Group Termination (V10)	0.501	3.982	<0.05		
Analysis of Variance					
Source	SS	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Regression	372.136	8	46.517	1.986	0.00
Residual	2084.495	89	23.421		
Total	2456.631	97			

The above findings in Table 6 in case of Hotels revealed that the 8 variables yielded a multiple R of 0.845 explaining 71.4 % of the variance in teamwork effectiveness in hotels. The multiple regression analysis revealed that the major contribution comes from group readiness for work, group work, relational dimension and information dimension. The overall analysis reveals that the group dynamics in hotel is highly effective.

Table 7
RESULTS OF MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF ALL THE DIMENSIONS OF COMMUNICATION AND GROUP DYNAMICS FOR PREDICTING TEAMWORK EFFECTIVENESS OF RETAIL CHAINS

Variable	Regression Coefficient	t	P	R	R Square
Information Dimension (V2)	0.334	2.183	<0.05	0.661	0.436
Relational Dimension (V3)	0.579	3.881	<0.05		
Information/relational dimension (V4)	0.404	3.288	<0.05		
Group Loyalty (V6)	0.463	3.525	<0.05		
Group Conflict (V7)	-0.603	-5.622	<0.05		
Group Readiness for Work (V8)	0.638	3.966	<0.05		
Group Work (V9)	0.688	3.975	<0.05		
Group Termination (V10)	0.487	2.225	<0.05		
Analysis of Variance					
Source	SS	df.	Mean Square	F	P

Regression	421.01	8	52.626	2.833	0.000
Residual	1690.424	91	18.576		
Total	2111.434	99			

The above findings in Table 7 in case of Retail chains revealed that the 8 variables yielded a multiple R of 0.661 explaining 43.6 % of the variance in teamwork effectiveness. The multiple regression analysis revealed that the major contribution comes from group readiness for work, group work, relational dimension and group conflict. The overall analysis reveals that the communication satisfaction and group dynamics in retail chains are moderate.

Findings of the Study

The outcome of the study showed that communication, group dynamics and teamwork between departments are important components for teamwork effectiveness and elements for future study. In order to find out whether there is a significant impact of service sector organisations (banks, hotels & retail chains) on teamwork effectiveness (*Hypothesis 1*), the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The finding revealed that the impact of service sector organizations (banks, hotels and retail chains) is significant on teamwork effectiveness in service sector where $F(2, 294)=28.4$, $P=0.00$ at 5percent significance level which implies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted with 95% confidence level (Table 3). As far as this study is concerned banks have better teamwork effectiveness as compared to hotels and retail chains (*Hypothesis 2*) and the above findings in (Table 5) in case of Banks revealed that the 8 variables yielded a multiple R of 0.951 explaining 90.4% of the variance in teamwork effectiveness in banks which is far better than hotels and retail chains. Regarding the communication satisfaction level i.e., (*Hypothesis 3*) banks have better communication practices and strategies than hotels and retail chains where the multiple regression analysis (Table 5) revealed that the major contribution comes from information dimension, relational dimension, information/relational dimension whereas hotels proved to be effective in group dynamics among their employees when compared to banks and retail chains (*Hypothesis 4*) where the multiple regression analysis revealed that the major contribution comes from group readiness for work and group work (Table 6).

SUGGESTIONS

Suggestions below can assist banks, hotels in general and retail chains to use and enhance team effectiveness:

1. There should be training programmes for hotel and banking sector employees to cure team effectiveness deficiencies, especially in the field of communication and collaboration.
2. The management of banking and hotel sectors should establish clear communication systems for their employees to have clear understanding of their goals and the company objectives.
3. The management of banking and hotel sector should promote team building among their work force with skills and knowledge appropriate to their task to improve cooperation between stakeholders.
4. Training should be imparted to the employees of both the sectors to develop key communication skills and to socialize members to adopt a cooperative approach, especially for teams rated low on teamwork effectiveness.
5. While individual effort is recognized in organisations, more emphasis should be on teamwork in retail sector. As retail sector is people oriented and customer-centric, co-operation among the employees is highly necessary for smooth and efficient functioning. Hence, employees must be provided with regular training on group dynamics to develop effective communication and teamwork.

CONCLUSION

After a thorough review of literature and from the findings of the study, it has to be accepted that employees are the most valuable assets of the organization and the only sustainable source of competitive advantage. Communication is critical for an organization's success and effectiveness. Communication is not only one of the most important parts of people's lives, but in a group context especially is very intertwined with the group dynamics affecting how the group functions. Communication along with group dynamics play an important role as far as the teamwork effectiveness is concerned in organisations. Management needs to recognize employee communication and group dynamics as strategic and should learn to lever its capabilities in maximizing the team efforts. Thus, employee communication must play a strategic role in an organization in order to work effectively.

REFERENCES

- Akintayo, D.L., & Faniran, J.O. (2012). Analysis of group dynamics and interpersonal relations among employees: The case of Nigerian breweries in OYO state. *International Review of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(7), 37-45.
- Arulrajah, A.A., & Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2012). An exploratory study on the personal qualities & characteristics expected by the organizations for key HRM jobs in Sri Lanka. *Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3(1), 32-48.
- Bisen, V., & Priya (2008). *Business communication*. India: New Age International.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99-109.
- Bushe, G.R., & Coetzer, G.H. (2007). Group development and team effectiveness: Using cognitive representations to measure group development and predict task performance and group viability. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 43(2), 184-212.
- Campbell, J.P. (1990). Modelling the performance prediction problem in industry and organisational psychology. In M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology* (pp. 687-732). Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Carton, A.M., & Cummings, J.N. (2012). A theory of subgroups in work teams. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(3), 441-470.
- Cherry, S., & Robillard, P.N. (2008). *Importance of peer-to-peer ad hoc collaboration in the development of large software systems*. ERGO-IA.
- Chitrao, P. (2014). Internal communication satisfaction as an employee motivation tool in the retail sector in Pune. *The European Journal of Social & Behavioural Sciences*, 1541-1552.
- Miller, C.J., Kim, B., Silverman, A., & Bauer, M.S. (2018). A systematic review of team-building interventions in non-acute healthcare settings. *BMC Health Services Research*, 18(1), 146.
- Chou, S.Y., & Garcia, C.D. (2011). Group organizational citizenship behavior in the stages of group development. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(10), 3-15.
- Communicationtheory.org (2010). Communication theory: Kinds (types) employed by business organizations.
- Clampitt, P.G., & Downs, C.W. (1993). Employee perceptions of the relationship between communication and productivity: A field study. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 30(1), 5-28.
- Duncan, T., & Moriarty, S.E. (1998). A communication-based marketing model for managing relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(2), 1-13.
- Etta, C.G., & James, A.W. (2012). Retail managers: Laissez-faire leadership is synonymous with unsuccessful conflict management styles. *Open Journal of Leadership*, 1(3), 13-16.
- Finn, R., Currie, G., & Martin, G. (2010). Team work in context: Institutional mediation in the public-service professional bureaucracy. *Organization Studies*, 31(8), 1069-1097.
- Forsyth, D.R. (2010). *Group dynamics*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Cengage.
- Guzzo, R.A., & Dickson, M.W. (1996). Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance and effectiveness. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47, 307-338.

- Hoyt, C.L., & Blascovich, J. (2003). Transformational and transactional leadership in virtual and physical environments. *Small Group Research*, 34, 678-715.
- Janis, I.L. (1982). *Groupthink: Psychological studies of policy decisions and fiascoes*. Boston, Massachusetts, USA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kaifi, B.A., & Noorie, S.A. (2011). Organisational behaviour: A study on managers, employees and teams. *Journal of Management Policy & Practice*, 12(1), 88-97.
- Kelchner, L. (2013). Strengths & weaknesses of cross-functional teams.
- Kelly, A.E., Goulden, M., Meadows, M.W., Bales, R.C., & Winston, G. (2011). *Water and carbon cycling along the sierra Nevada climate gradient*. Fall meeting, American Geophysical Union.
- Kolfschoten, I.G, Regazzi, R., Roggli, E., & Nesca, V. (2011). Role and therapeutic potential of micro RNA's in diabetes. *Diabetes ObesMetab*, 11(4), 118-129.
- Krebs, S.A., Hobman, E.V., & Bordia, P. (2006). Virtual teams and group member dissimilarity: Consequences for the development of trust. *Small Group Research*, 37(6), 721-741.
- Lloyd, C., & Newell, H. (2000). Selling teams to the salesforce. In S. Procter & F. Mueller (Eds.), *Teamworking* (pp. 183-202). Macmillan, Houndmills.
- Lira, E.M., Ripoll, P., Peiro, J.M., & Zornoza, A.M. (2008). The role of information and communication technologies in the relationship between group effectiveness and group potency: A longitudinal study. *Small Group Research*, 39(6), 728-745.
- Lewén, B., & Philip, H. (1998). *Leading project management*. Nerenius & Santérus Publisher, Sweden.
- Lind, J., & Skarvad, P. (1997). *New teams in the organizations world*. Liber AB, Sweden.
- Lewin, K. (1943). Defining the field at a given time. *Psychological Review*, 50(3), 292-310.
- McEwan D, Ruissen GR, Eys MA, Zumbo BD, Beauchamp MR (2017). The Effectiveness of Teamwork Training on Teamwork Behaviors and Team Performance: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Controlled Interventions. *PLoS ONE, A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal*, 12(1).
- Monga, A., Verma, N., & Monga, O.P. (2015). A study of job satisfaction of employees of ICICI bank in Himachal Pradesh. *Human Resource Management Research*, 5(1), 18-25.
- Mughal, M.R., & Khan, M. (2013). Impact of conflict and conflict management on organisational performance. *International Journal of Modern Business Issues of Global Market (IJMBIGM)*, 1(3), 1-19.
- Ober, S. (2001). *Contemporary business communication*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Ocker, R.J., Huang, H., Benbunan-Fich, R., & Hiltz, S.R. (2011). Leadership dynamics in partially distributed teams: An exploratory study of the efforts of configuration and distance. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 20(3), 273-292.
- Orpen, C. (1997). The interactive effects of communication quality and job involvement on managerial job satisfaction and work motivation. *The Journal of Psychology*, 131(5), 519-522.
- Patel, H., Pettitt, M., & Wilson, J.R. (2012). Factors of collaborative working: A framework for a collaboration model. *Applied Ergonomics*, 43(1), 1-26.
- Pfeffer, J. (2013). You're still the same: Why theories of power hold over time and across contexts. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27(4), 269-280.
- Postmes, T. (2003). A social identity approach to communication in organizations. In S.A. Haslam, D. Van Knippenberg, M.J. Platow & N. Ellemers (Eds.), *Social Identity at Work: Developing Theory for Organizational Practice* (pp. 81-98). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J.M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1217-1227.
- Scarnati, J.T. (2001). On becoming a team player. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 7(1/2), 5-10.
- Shapiro, S.L., Lopez, A.M., Schwartz, G.E., Bootzin, R., Figueredo, A.J., Braden, C.J., & Kurker, S.F. (2001). Quality of life and breast cancer: Relationship to psychosocial variables. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 57(4), 501-509.
- Rahim, S.A., & Tuli, F.A. (2013). The effectiveness of communication practices with the customers: A comparative study between eastern bank limited and mutual trust bank limited. *Asian Business Review*, 3(3), 31-39.
- Nischal, S. (2013). Exploring conflict management mechanism and relationship between demographics and conflict handling styles in private sector commercial banks. *Pacific Business Review International*, 6(1), 1-14.
- Sanyal, S., & Hisam, M.W. (2018). The impact of teamwork on work performance of employees: A study of faculty members of Dhofar University. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 20(3), 15-22.

- Spring, M.B., & Vathanophas, V. (2003). Peripheral social awareness information in collaborative work. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 54(11), 1006-1013.
- Verburg, R.M., Bosch-Sijtsema, P., & Vartiainen, M. (2013). Getting it done: Critical success factors for project managers in virtual work settings. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(1), 68-79.
- Welbourne, T.M., Johnson, D.E., & Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale: Validity analysis of a theory-based measure. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(5), 540-555.
- Salman, W.A., & Hassan, Z. (2016). Impact of effective teamwork on employee performance. *International Journal of Accounting & Business Management*, 4(1), 76-85.
- Whetten, D.A., & Cameron, K.S. (2011). *Developing management skills*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Prentice Hall/Pearson.
- Wright, R.R., Mohr, C.D., & Sinclair, R.R. (2014). Conflict on the treatment floor: An investigation of interpersonal conflict experienced by nurses. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 19(1), 26-37.
- Zhu, Y., May, S.K., & Rosenfeld, L.B. (2004). Information adequacy and job satisfaction during merger and acquisition. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 18(2), 241-270.