

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT & TEAM EFFECTIVENESS IN IT SECTOR

Sarath S Unnithan
University of Madras

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to test a model of the effects of conflict in team decision-making and its effectiveness on team performance and affective responses. The relationship between conflict and performance outcomes. This study helps managers to understand how to benefit from conflict. In a highly competitive environment, disagreement among team members about "how to do it" seems to decrease decision-making effectiveness. Conflict is measure through TKI model of conflict and team effectiveness is measure through T7 model of team effectiveness. Also in this article I am proposing a new effective method for team effectiveness. This study fills a gap in the conflict literature concerning the impact of conflict in the team members' perceptions of decision-making effectiveness and how it affects the overall performance. Moreover, this study also clarifies the importance of past performance to the actual team outcomes.

Introduction

At the point when persons initially meet, each brings a horde of previous convictions and information for instance, extraordinary data, understandings, intentions, viewpoints, and moral or good convictions. Such contrasts incline them toward difference. as the verbalization of these difference starts with an outflow of contradiction and finishes when the group either settle the issue or changes the subject (Baxter, 1982). Groups on a very basic level experience two sorts of contention: task-situated and individuals arranged. The previous concerns the substance of the work that should be done, for example, thoughts or techniques. The last happens regarding such things as battles for authority, inconsistent outstanding tasks at hand, and character contrasts. These can occur at the same time, and any scene can contain components of both errand arranged and individuals situated issues. Previous contrasts propose why clashes emerge however they don't clarify why a contention rises as errand arranged or individuals situated. One way that colleagues get a fix on this is through point of view taking-that is, participating in Conflict-which can be comprehended correspondence that permits a precise comprehension of others' reactions. Along these lines they can appreciate both the data being introduced by the individuals who can't help contradicting them and furthermore the perspectives from which it comes (Johnson and Johnson, 1979). With more noteworthy point of view taking aptitudes, colleagues will comprehend that others have different sees and will foresee differences. They will almost certain react to struggle by endeavouring to comprehend the other individual. Colleagues who don't comprehend or take others' viewpoints will be less open minded toward strife and will in general react by assaulting the individual rather than the errand. Along these lines, all in all, the measure of point of view taking that happens inside a group predicts the sort of contention that will happen. The kind of contention that happens impacts group adequacy. How about we investigate what examination has seen as the essential elements of group adequacy and how the two sorts of contention identify with these. The Dimensions of Effectiveness Team viability can be comprehended as having three measurements: execution, endurance, and improvement (Hackman, 1987). Execution is the thing that we regularly consider when we think about adequacy; it is the group's gainful yield in tern of choices or arrangements. A group that doesn't see itself as an effectively performing unit, in any case, may not need, nor even be capable, to endure paying little heed to its real execution. Markers of endurance incorporate individuals' convictions about the group's adequacy and achievement, and fulfillment with the group. At last, the group and all individuals must create, not deteriorate. Both endurance and advancement are turning out to be significant segments of group viability as associations turn increasingly more to utilizing groups. Execution

Theoretical Analysis

The two kinds of contention impact exercises, and therefore adequacy, in an unexpected way. Groups occupied with task-situated clash direct their activities toward their work; the contention drives them to be worried about assignment capacities and to address issues concerning it. Paradoxically, during individuals situated clash,

activities are coordinated toward individuals' relations with one another. Either sort of contention may keep a group from showing up at an answer for an issue without completely understanding the outcomes; it can compel individuals to address a portion of their suspicions and abrogate their taking a stab at unanimity, along these lines prompting better execution. Some contention of either sort is useful, however task-arranged clash should prompt better group execution since it powers conversation and goals of undertaking related issues. Proof recommends that the nonappearance of contention and an excess of contention may both be unfavourable, while some contention is really helpful to group and individuals need to convey about part jobs and errand. Colleagues need to impart about part jobs and assignment. One significant specialized apparatus is point of view takingmembers can use all alone to decide the viewpoints of thers-for example: (1 selfdisclosure; (2) job inversion (anempting to take the other individual's view to comprehend where they are coming from and why they feel as they do):and (,3) undivided attention. The lastrequires the colleague who is accepting the correspondence to truly tune in to what exactly is being said by posing inquiries about substance and sentiments. also, rehashing uhat the person has heard.

Chiefs can likewise lead the group through activities intended to decide the alternate points of view held by individuals and their significance to the group in general. I have created one such exercise. the "Information Importance Grid." which assists individuals with plotting the different viewpoints existing in the team and talk about the significance of each of these (,Sessa, 1993).

There are numerous strategies that Smith, 1989; Wall, Galanes, and Love, 1987). What stays to be resolved is when it gets unfavourable for a group to experience rehashed clashes. Endurance struggle to group endurance are blended. Individuals from groups participating in task oriented strife report more prominent individual adequacy and promise to the group's choice than individuals from groups advised to stay away from strife, take part in banter (that is, simply to introduce one's own conclusion), or work independently

Review of Literature

Johnson, Johnson, and Smith, 1989; Wall, Galanes, and Love, 1987). Undertaking focused clash may lead the group to consider more choices and to evaluate the results of the choices all the more cautiously, advancing sentiments of certainty. There is little examination that straightforwardly evaluates the connection between individuals arranged clash andThe consequences of exploration that relate members' convictions about the achievement of the team. Regarding fulfilment, although some contemplates recommend that it is contrarily identified with the measure of contention (Johnson, Johnson, and Smith, 1989; Wall, Galanes, and Love, 1987; Wall and Nolan, 1986), others really find that contention leads to greater fulfilment than banter, simultaneousness chasing, no contention, or individualistic endeavours (Johnson, Johnson, and Smith,1989); and some propose that conflict leads to momentary disappointment during the strife yet higher long haul fulfilment (Gottman and Krokoff, 1989). One explanation behind these blended outcomes may be their absence of separation between task oriented strife and individuals oriented conflict. Groups occupied with task-oriented conflict might be more fulfilled than teams engaged in individuals situated clash.

Development from struggle since strife can stimulate viewpoint taking. Besides, tests have found that individuals in groups advised to connect with in task-arranged clash show better problem-unravelling than people told to reach an agreement (Smith, Johnson, &Johnson, 1981). Maybe strife powers the group to take part in exercises such as exploring choices to locate the best or the right choice, though simultaneousness looking for coordinates the group accentuate understanding and stay away from practical appraisals of elective thoughts and approaches. In spite of the fact that the impacts of individuals arranged clash on learning have not been explored, it is conceivable that group associated with individuals situated clash are creating group standards, jobs, and aptitudes.

Design/methodology/approach

A sample of 400individuals, working in 61 different teams, participated in this study. Three questionnaires were sent directly to team members by e-mail at different times of the challenge period to collect data concerning demographic data (questionnaire 1), perceptions of team functioning (questionnaire 2) and perceptions of team decision-making effectiveness as well as the affective responses (questionnaire 3). The level of analysis in this study was the group. Thus, all individual survey responses were aggregated to the team level for statistical analysis. The T7 Model of Team Effectiveness In an attempt to understand how teams work, Michael Lombardo and Robert Eichinger originally developed the T7 Model in 1995 to represent the key facets that influence the performance of work teams. Based upon their review of the research literature, they identified five factors inside

the team and two factors outside the team which impact team effectiveness. Each one of the factors was named to begin with the letter "T." Hence, the name T7 Model. The five internal team factors include: • Thrust – a common purpose about what needs to be accomplished or team goal(s) • Trust – in each other as teammates • Talent – the collective skills of the team members to get the job done • Teaming Skills – operating effectively and efficiently as a team • Task Skills – executing successfully or getting the job done The two external team factors are: • Team-Leader Fit – the degree to which the team leader satisfies the needs of the team members • Team Support from the Organization – the extent to which the leadership of the organization enables the team to perform Each of the factors inside the team can be delineated into sub-factors or dimensions. For example, "thrust" refers to agreed upon vision, mission, values, and goals among members within a team. Moreover, members employ a common strategy and tactics to accomplish goals. Specifically, thrust consists of the following three behavioral ... [Lombardo and Eichinger] developed the T7 Model in 1995 to represent the key facets that influence the performance of work teams. TEAM SUPPORT FROM THE ORGANIZATION TEAM LEADER FIT Thrust common purpose Trust in each other Talent collective skills Teaming operate effectively Task execute successfully 5 dimensions: (a) thrust management, (b) thrust clarity, and (c) thrust commitment. In contrast, "trust" includes the following dimensions: (a) trust in truthful communication, (b) trust in actions, and (c) trust inside the team. In total, the five internal factors consist of 18 dimensions of team effectiveness

The Thomas Kilmann Instrument (developed by Thomas Kilmann, 1974) has been the leader in conflict resolution assessment Thomas - Kilmann Instrument (TKI) Conflict Mode is been used for assessing the level of conflict among the employees as TKI is considered to be the best tool for this purpose.

The instrument uses two parameters, i.e., assertiveness and cooperation, resulting in five distinct styles: avoiding, competing, collaborating, accommodating and compromising

When people find themselves in conflict, their behaviour can be described in terms of where it lies along two independent dimensions—assertiveness and cooperativeness. Assertiveness is the degree to which you try to satisfy your own concerns, and cooperativeness is the degree to which you try to satisfy the other person's concerns.

So the present study utilizes the TKI in order to analyse the conflict of employees in Indian IT sector.

Findings

Results showed a full mediation effect of perceptions of team decision in the relationship between process conflict and team performance. Task and relationship conflict showed no significant relationships with team performance and satisfaction with the team. The result that effective past performance feedback directly influences team performance, in a positive way, suggests that past effective decisions may reinforce the decision-making processes previously used by team members.

Conclusion

One possible limitation of this study is the fact that measurements were taken at different times of the management challenge. . This time measurement difference could raise some questions concerning the stability of the intragroup conflict over time in work teams. Future research should address this hypothesis. Conflict is measure through TKI model of conflict and team effectiveness is measure through T7 model of team effectiveness. If the conflict is duly handled in teams, the team effectiveness will be at the optimum level and it will make the organisation to achieve overall goal and objectives. So in my research, I try to make a model which is effective to reduce the conflict among the team members and to make the team effectiveness at the optimum level. I also proposing a research model named S4 model of team effectiveness as taking conflict as the independent variable and Sacrifice, Empathy, Mutual dependence as dependent variable.

References

- Baxter, L. A. (1982). Conflict management: An episodic approach. *Small Group Behaviour*, 13, 23-42. Bower, G. H. (1983). Affect and cognition. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 302,387-403.
- Brown, J. D. (1984). Effects of induced mood on causal attributions for success and failure. *Motivation and Emotion*, 8, 343-353.

Buxton, L. (1981). Do you panic about math? London: Heinemann. Carnevale

P. J. D., & Isen, A. M. (1986). The influence of positive affect and visual access on the discovery of integrative solutions in bilateral negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 37, 1-13.

Cosier, R. A., & Schwenk, C. R. (1990). Agreement and thinking alike: Ingredients for decisions. *Academy of Management Executive*, 4, 69-74

Smith, K., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1981). Can conflict be constructive: Controversy versus concurrence seeking in learning groups. *Journal of Educational*

Wall, V. D., Galanes, G. J., & Love, S. B. (1987). Small, task-oriented groups: Conflict, conflict management, satisfaction, and decision quality. *Small Group Behavior*,

Smith, K. K., & Berg, D. N. (1987). *A Psychology*, 5, 65 1-663. IS, 31-55.

Wall, V. D., & Nolan, L. (1986). Perceptions of inequity, satisfaction, and conflict in task-oriented groups. *Human Relations*, 39, Williams, K. J. (1991, April). Daily mood states in employed women:

Variation, antecedents, and consequences. Paper 1033-1052. presented at the sixth annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology,

MO. Wright, J., & Mischel, W. (1982). Influence of affect on cognitive social learning person variables. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 90 1-9 14

