

# Team Effectiveness and Performance Among Employees in A State College in Iloilo, Philippines

SHIELA MAY B. LABAJO, PhD

*Abstract* — This survey-correlational research determined the team effectiveness and performance of employees in a state college. The antecedent variables were length of working experience, position, educational attainment, and type of personnel. The independent variables was team performance and the team effectiveness was the dependent variable. The study was conducted among 105 randomly selected employees in a state institution of higher learning in the province of Iloilo. One adopted, validated and pilot tested research questionnaire and another one standardized data gathering instrument were used; the Team Effectiveness Questionnaire (London leadership academy, 2020) and the actual accomplished performance rating using the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS). Statistical tools were frequency count, percentage analysis, rank, mean, and standard, Kruskal Wallis H, Mann Whitney U test, and the Spearman rho. Significance level for all inferential test was set at 0.05 alpha. Findings of the study revealed that, the employees as a whole is effective as a team. But when employees were classified as to position those who are working as administrative support staff, administrative head, and faculty with designation are also effective as a team but those faculty without designation were just moderately effective as a team. On the other hand, performance of employees as a whole was outstanding. When they were grouped as to length of working experience, position, educational qualification, and type of personnel. Those employees having an experience of 11 to 20 years or 21 years and above; working as administrative head or faculty with or without designation; finished a degree of masters or doctorate; and for those who were teaching personnel have an outstanding performance. While those employees having an experience of 10 years and below; working as administrative support staff; finished a baccalaureate degree; and those who were non-teaching personnel have an very satisfactory performance. Moreover, a significant difference were noted in the employees team effectiveness classified according to position, but no significant difference were noted when they were classified as to length of working experience, educational qualification, and type of personnel. And as to employees team performance a significant difference were noted when they were classified according to position, educational qualification, and type of personnel, but no significant difference when they were classified as to length of working experience. Finally, negative and no significant relationship existed between team effectiveness and team performance.

*Keywords* — *Team Effectiveness, Team Performance, Employees*

## I. Introduction

As organizations continue to expand and transform, the opportunities for workplace problems also strengthens. Organizations typically face one or more of three potential levels of conflict, one of these is the conflict among employees in working as a team that results to poor

performance. To enable them to be high performing, teams must be dedicated to working toward an agreed goal.

In today's modern world, we have to go way apart from the philanthropic works for teamwork is usually applied in attaining an organizations common goal. Teams have become the approach of choice when organizations are affront with complex and difficult undertakings.

The importance of teamwork in the organization give the picture that the idea of two people or more tend better rather than the idea of one person, the result that a team is much better rather than the sum of its part (individual member), the team members can know and trust each other, so that they can help each other and teamwork can cause the communication runs smoothly that results to a positive changes (Logan, 2016). In the organization, each individual contributes his performance to the team, then the team will contribute their performance to the organization. In the effective organization, management always creates positive synergy, which produces the whole becomes greater than the sum of all the component parts.

There is no doubt that teams have a dominant bounce on the performance of the employees and the future of the organization. The studies that have been conducted on the subject shows that the perceptions of teams is worthwhile and essential to facilitate the developmental process in the organization and to reinforce employees' performance (Fransen, et.al, 2013). Simply, the main goal of teamwork is to apply an effective method in order to improve the occupational performance of employees and their personal skills and talents that serve the requirements of the job.

A study on factors influencing team effectiveness in higher education by Zarraga-Rodriguez, et.al (2015) which discussed that organizations must fulfill in order to produce and sustain effective teams. Many factors can affect how effectively teams perform. Thus, this study offered the results of an investigation of the factors that donate to team effectiveness in higher education. Task interconnection, task emulation and personality traits appeared as key influences on team effectiveness.

The study "Factors Influencing Team Effectiveness in Higher Education" by D'Silva and Ahrari (2016) gave the results of an investigation of the factors that donate to team effectiveness in higher education.

Ahyaruddin, M., & Akbar, R. (2016) believes that the performance of an organizational system is a complex relationship involving seven performance criteria that must be followed: effectiveness, efficiency, quality, productivity, quality of work, innovation and profitability. According to Brown's theory, performance is influenced by the environment, the objectives to be achieved and the relevant and recognizable features.

Performance is quantity and/or quality of the result of the individual work in the organization in working with the major task and purpose which is guided by norm, standard, procedure operational, criteria, and premises that already assigned or applied in the organization

(Gavrea, C., Ilies, L., & Stegorean, R. 2011). Further they explains that measure of the categories of performance include the following: (a) Effective. This indicator measures degree of suitability output produced to achieve something needed; (b) Efficient.

The influence of teamwork on employees' job-related performance has been a leading topic of many researches worked by scholars and practitioners in the past years (Manzoor et al, 2011). The logic behind this attention is the fact that the sensible concept of teamwork has a great influence on the performance of every organization and its employees who strive in it.

In a study exploring the effects of intragroup conflict and past performance feedback on team effectiveness conducted by Passos and Caetano, (2015) the results showed a full mediation effect of awareness of team decision in the relationship between process competition and team performance.

Another study on the impact of teamwork on work performance of employees was conducted by Sanyal and Hisam (2018). This research study shows that teamwork, team trust and performance appraisal, leadership and structure, and rewards have a significant and clear impact on the performance of faculty members in Dhofar University.

The objectives of this study was to determine the degree of team effectiveness and level of team performance among the employees in a state college. It also aimed to identify if there was a relationship between team effectiveness and team performance. The result of the study would be very beneficial to the administration specifically for the office of Human Resource Management for this will give them the idea of what programs to establish to come up with an environment that encourage positivity among the employees and thus build a strong positive and performing team.

## II. Methodology

The survey - correlational method of research was used in this study to ascertain the relationships between team effectiveness and team performance. The participants of the study were the 105 randomly selected regular employees in a state college in the province of Iloilo, Philippines. To gather more specific information on the team effectiveness and performance among employees, the researcher used the adopted, validated and pilot-tested data gathering instruments which were the Team Effectiveness Questionnaire and the actual accomplished performance rating using the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS). The data gathered in this study were analyzed and interpreted using the Mean, Standard Deviation, Kruskal Wallis H Test, Mann Whitney U Test, and Spearman rho as statistical tools. All statistical computations were were tallied, classified, analyzed and processed through the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

### III. Results and Discussion

#### Employees Team Effectiveness

The data in Table 1 showed that over-all, the team effectiveness of the employees in this study was “effective” ( $M = 4.05$ ,  $SD = 0.68$ ). The same team effectiveness was found when they were grouped according to the following categories, specifically in terms of the length of experience, those employees who worked 10 years and below ( $M = 4.07$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ), 11 to 20 years ( $M = 3.98$ ,  $SD = 0.80$ ) and 21 years and above ( $M = 4.09$ ,  $SD = 0.75$ ) were “effective”; in terms of position, team effectiveness of both employees who are administrative support staff ( $M = 4.15$ ,  $SD = 0.45$ ), administrative head ( $M = 3.99$ ,  $SD = 0.56$ ) and faculty with designation ( $M = 4.36$ ,  $SD = 0.60$ ) were “effective” while those faculty without designation ( $M = 3.50$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ) were “moderately effective”; while in terms of the educational qualification, team effectiveness of those employees having a degree of baccalaureate ( $M = 4.07$ ,  $SD = 0.46$ ), Master’s ( $M = 3.99$ ,  $SD = 0.80$ ) and Doctorate ( $M = 4.08$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ) were “effective”; and in terms of the type of personnel, both employees who were non-teaching ( $M = 4.13$ ,  $SD = 0.48$ ), and teaching ( $M = 3.97$ ,  $SD = 0.83$ ) were also “effective”.

This implies that personal variables have no direct influence on the team effectiveness of the employees. The study on teacher team effectiveness and teachers well-being affirmed the findings that length of working experience, position, educational qualification, and type of personnel have no direct influence on team effectiveness. (Jacobson, et.al, 2016).

Team effectiveness is defined as performance and employee satisfaction. More explicitly, it is the degree to which a group’s output meets the requirements in terms of quantity, quality, and timeliness; the group experience improves it’s members’ ability to work a a group in the future, and the group experience contributes to individual satisfaction (Hackman, 2018).

Table 1. *Team Effectiveness of the Employees*

Category	SD	Mean	Description
A. Entire Group	0.68	4.05	Effective
B. Length of Working Experience			
10 years and Below	0.58	4.07	Effective
11 to 20 Years	0.80	3.99	Effective
21 Years and Above	0.75	4.09	Effective
C. Position			
Administrative Support Staff	0.45	4.15	Effective
Administrative Head	0.56	3.99	Effective
Faculty with Designation	0.60	4.36	Effective
Faculty without Designation	0.85	3.50	Moderately Effective
D. Educational Qualification			
Baccalaureate Degree	0.46	4.07	Effective
Masters Degree	0.80	3.99	Effective
Doctorate Degree	0.78	4.08	Effective
E. Type of Personnel			
Non-teaching Personnel	0.48	4.13	Effective
Teaching Personnel	0.83	3.97	Effective

*Note:* 4.51 - 5.0, Absolutely Effective; 3.51 - 4.50, Effective; 2.51 – 3.50, Moderately Effective; 1.51 – 2.50, Ineffective; 1.00 – 1.50, Absolutely Ineffective.

### Employees Team Performance

As revealed in Table 2, generally, the team performance of the employees in this study was “outstanding” (M=4.55, SD=0.40). Likewise, similar findings were revealed when they were classified according to the following categories, specifically in terms of the length of experience, those employees having an experience of 10 years and below (M=4.48, SD=0.41) performs “very satisfactory” while both employees having an experience of 11 to 20 years (M=4.65, SD=0.39) and 21 years and above (M=4.61, SD=0.38) performs “outstanding”; in terms of position, employees who are administrative support staff (M=4.38, SD=0.37) performs “very satisfactory” while both employees who are administrative head (M=4.71, SD=0.28), faculty with designation (M=4.70, SD=0.39), and faculty without designation (M=4.60, SD=0.43) performs “outstanding”; while in terms of the educational qualification, employees having a degree of baccalaureate (M=4.39, SD=0.38) performs “very satisfactory”, while both employees having a degree of Master’s (M=4.58, SD=0.39) and Doctorate (M=4.74, SD=0.37) performs “outstanding”; and in terms of the type of personnel, those employees who were non-teaching (M=4.13, SD=0.48) performs “very satisfactory” while employees who were teaching (M=3.97, SD=0.83) performs “outstanding”.

This result means that employees are performing very well with their assigned task. Employees who have more working experiences, higher educational degree, and working as head of the department and as a faculty performs better than those who have less experience, baccalaureate graduate and working as support staff.

According to the theory proposed by Folan environment could shaped performance, the goals it wants achieved and the relevant and significant features. Neely (2012) believes that performance should consider quantifying the efficiency and effectiveness of actions.

Table 2. *Team Performance of the Employees*

Category	SD	Mean	Description
A. Entire Group	0.40	4.55	Outstanding
B. Length of Working Experience			
10 years and Below	0.41	4.48	Very Satisfactory
11 to 20 Years	0.39	4.65	Outstanding
21 Years and Above	0.38	4.61	Outstanding
C. Position			
Administrative Support Staff	0.37	4.38	Very Satisfactory
Administrative Head	0.28	4.71	Outstanding
Faculty with Designation	0.39	4.70	Outstanding
Faculty without Designation	0.43	4.60	Outstanding
D. Educational Qualification			
Baccalaureate Degree	0.38	4.39	Very Satisfactory
Masters Degree	0.39	4.58	Outstanding
Doctorate Degree	0.37	4.74	Outstanding
E. Type of Personnel			
Non-teaching Personnel	0.37	4.45	Very Satisfactory
Teaching Personnel	0.40	4.66	Outstanding

Note: 4.51 - 5.0, Outstanding; 3.51 - 4.50, Very Satisfactory; 2.51 – 3.50, Satisfactory; 1.51 – 2.50, Unsatisfactory; 1.00 – 1.50, Poor.

### Differences in the Employees Team Effectiveness

As shown in Table 3, the Kruskal-Wallis H test results reveal that there is no significant differences existed in the team effectiveness of the regular employees when they are classified as to length of working experience, ( $\chi^2$ )= 0.342,  $p = 0.843$ ,  $p < .05$ ); position, ( $\chi^2$ )= 19.459,  $p = 0.000$ ,  $p < .05$ ; and educational qualification ( $\chi^2$ )= 0.075,  $p = 0.963$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

I. The result implies that personal variable position has an influence on the team effectiveness of the employees. But personal variables such as length of working experience,

educational qualification, and type of personnel have no direct influence on the team effectiveness of the employees. Because in the study “Factors Influencing Team Effectiveness in Higher Education” by D’Silva, J. L., & Ahrari, S. (2016) the study offers the results of an investigation of the factors that donate to team effectiveness in higher education. The task interdependence, task conflict and personality traits appeared as key influences on team effectiveness.

Table 3. *Kruskal-Wallis H Test Resultsof the Differences in the Team Effectiveness as Assesses by the Employees classified according to Length of Experience, Position, and Educational Qualification*

Team Effectiveness	Chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ )	df	p-value	Decision
Length of Work Experience	0.342	2	0.843	Not Significant
Position	19.459	3	0.000	Significant
Educational Qualification	0.075	2	0.963	Not Significant

\* $p < .05$

Since significant differences existed in the team effectiveness as assessed by the employees when classified according to position, Mann Whitney Comparison was employed as a post hoc test to determine the significant differences between categories. It was further shown in table 4, that faculty w/o designation was more effective than administrative support staff and faculty with designation.

Table 4. *Mann-Whitney U Post Hoc Test Result of the Difference in the Employees Team Effectiveness classified according to position between categories*

Team Effectiveness	z-value	p-value	Decision
Admin Support Staff vs. Admin Head	-1.246	0.213	Not Significant
Admin Support Staff vs. Faculty w/Designation	-1.930	0.054	Not Significant
Admin Support Staff vs. Faculty w/o Designation	-3.374	0.001	Significant
Admin Head vs. Faculty w/Designation	-1.965	0.049	Not Significant
Admin Head vs. Faculty w/o Designation	-1.844	0.065	Not Significant
Faculty w/Designation vs. Faculty w/o Designation	-3.719	0.000	Significant

\* $p < .05$

As shown in Table 5, the Mann-Whitney U test results reveal that there is no significant difference existed in the team effectiveness of the regular employees when they are classified as to the type of personnel,  $z = -0.594$ ,  $p = 0.553$ ,  $p < .05$ .

Table 5. *Mann-Whitney U Test Result of the Difference in the Team Effectiveness as Assesses by the Employees when classified according to the type of personnel*

Category	z-value	p-value	Decision
Type of Personnel	-0.594	0.553	Not Significant

\* $p < .05$

### Differences in the Employees Team Performance

The Kruskal-Wallis H test results in table 6 shows that there is no significant differences existed in the employees team performance when they are classified as to length of working experience, ( $\chi^2$ )= 4.632,  $p = 0.099$ ,  $p < .05$ ; while there is a significant differences existed in the employees team performance when they are classified as to position ( $\chi^2$ )= 15.142,  $p = 0.002$ ,  $p < .05$ ; and educational qualification ( $\chi^2$ )= 15.142,  $p = 0.000$ ,  $p < .05$ .

The result means that employees performance differ significantly in terms of their position, educational qualification, and as to type of personnel. This was affirmed by the results of the study by Sanyal and Hisam, (2018) “The Impact of Teamwork on Work Performance of Employees” that length of working experience, position, educational qualification, and type of employee have no direct influence on performance.

Table 6. *Kruskal-Wallis H Test Results of the Differences in the Employees Team Performance when according to length of working experience, position, and educational qualification*

Team Effectiveness	Chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ )	df	p-value	Decision
Length of Work Experience	4.632	2	0.099	Not Significant
Position	15.142	3	0.002	Significant
Educational Qualification	15.142	2	0.000	Significant

\* $p < .05$

Since significant differences existed in the employees performance when classified according to position, Mann Whitney Comparison was used as a post hoc test to determine the significant differences between categories. The data in table 7 shows that when classified according to position administrative head, faculty with designation, and faculty w/o designation performs better than the administrative support staff.



Table 7. *Mann-Whitney U Test Result of the Difference in the Employees Team Performance when classified according to the position between categories*

Team Performance	z-value	p-value	Decision
Admin Support Staff vs. Admin Head	-2.480	0.013	Significant
Admin Support Staff vs. Faculty w/Designation	-3.530	0.000	Significant
Admin Support Staff vs. Faculty w/o Designation	-2.333	0.020	Significant
Admin Head vs. Faculty w/Designation	-0.827	0.408	Not Significant
Admin Head vs. Faculty w/o Designation	-0.035	0.972	Not Significant
Faculty w/Designation vs. Faculty w/o Designation	-0.643	0.520	Not Significant

\* $p < .05$

Likewise significant differences existed in the employees performance when classified according to educational qualification, Mann Whitney Comparison was also used as a post hoc test to determine the significant differences between categories. The data in table 8 shows that when employees were classified according to educational qualification those with masters performs better than baccalaureate and those with doctorate performs better than baccalaureate and masters.

Table 8. *Mann-Whitney U Test Result of the Difference in the Employees Team Performance when classified according to the educational qualification between categories*

Team Performance	z-value	p-value	Decision
Baccalaureate vs. Masters	-2.028	0.043	Significant
Baccalaureate vs. Doctorate	-3.883	0.000	Significant
Masters vs. Doctorate	-2.094	0.036	Significant

As shown in Table 9, the Mann-Whitney U Test results revealed that there was a significant difference existed in the team performance of the regular employees when they are classified as to the type of personnel, ( $z = -3.279$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The teaching personnel performs better than the non-teaching personnel.

Table 9. *Mann-Whitney U Test Result of the Difference in the Team Performance of Employees classified according to the type of personnel*

Category	z-value	p-value	Decision
Type of Personnel	-3.279	0.001	Significant

### Relationship between Team Effectiveness and Team Performance

Result of Spearman’s rho test shows in table 10 that there was no significant relationship between team effectiveness and team performance, ( $r = 0.026$ ,  $p = 0.791$ ,  $p > .05$ ). This implies that team effectiveness could not be attributed to team performance.

This runs counter to the findings of the study on the impact of teamwork on work performance of employees conducted by Sanyal and Hisam (2018). This research study shows that teamwork, team trust and performance appraisal, leadership and structure, and rewards have a significant and clear impact on the performance of faculty members in Dhofar University.

Table 10. *Relationship between Team Effectiveness and Team Performance*

Variables	r-value	p-value	Decision
Effectiveness and Performance	0.026	0.791	Not Significant

### IV. Conclusion and Recommendations

In view of the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn: (1.) The employee in a state institution of higher learning in this research appears to have an effective team. In general, no matter how long an employees working experience, their educational attainment and to what type of personnel are they the employees possess a good sense of belongingness in the organization and motivated to work as a member of the team. They preferred to work with the team most of the time. This is also true to employees who are working as administrative support staff, head and faculty with designation. Meanwhile, when grouped as to position a faculty without designation appears to be moderately effective as a team. Somehow he possess a sense of belongingness in the organization and give effort as a member of the team but sometimes feel that they don’t need to give their best whenever at work and preferred to work with the team sometimes; (2) The employee’s performed outstanding as a team. They have demonstrated exceptional job mastery in all major areas of responsibility. Their achievement and contributions to the organization are of marked excellence; (3) Employees team effectiveness differ in terms of position but they are equally have the same team effectiveness in terms of the length of working experience, educational qualification, and type of personnel. Their action was sufficient to achieve the team’s purpose; (4) Length of working experience was a factor found not to influence the employees team performance, but on the other hand educational qualification, and type of personnel were factors found to significantly influence one’s performance. Their performance exceeded expectations. All goals, objectives, and targets were achieved above the established standards; and (5) effective team and outstanding performance among employees seems to be an

essential factors for an organization to be successful, as exemplified by the employee in a state institution of higher learning.

On the basis of the aforementioned conclusions, the following recommendations are hereby presented: (1) Schools officials in a state institution of higher learning shall find ways to encourage, develop and inculcate a culture of teamwork in the workplace. That would bring about continuous improvement in the employees performance and quality of the delivery of service. Because teamwork does not happen on its own. (2) Employees in a state institution of higher learning must be open to opportunities that would develop and foster teamwork and improve team effectiveness among themselves. (3) Educational planners and policy-makers may consider to come up with a policy and programs on enhancing positive attitude, strengthening teamwork and improving team performance among institutions in the Philippines. (4) Researchers may correlate their study on team effectiveness and performance. It is also suggested that similar research with relevant research methodology should be used in carrying out research in other institution to ascertain the degree of conformity which this research has on the influence of team effectiveness and performance of the employees.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Ahyaruddin, M., & Akbar, R. (2016). The relationship between the use of a performance measurement system, organizational factors, accountability, and the performance of public sector organizations. *Journal of Indonesian economy and business*, 31(1), 1-22.
- [2] Alafriz, C.K., & Calleja, D.M. (2012). Cooperative outcome interdependence, task reflexivity, and team effectiveness: a motivated information processing perspective. *Journal of applied psychology*, 92(3), 628.
- [3] Alghamdi, A., & Bach, C. (2018). Developing teamwork at workplace. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI)*, 7(2), 28-40.
- [4] Alliance, J. E. (2016). Enhancing teamwork in complex environments through team training. *Group Dynamics: Theory, research, and practice*, 1(2), 169.
- [5] D'Silva, J. L., & Ahrari, S. (2016). Factors influencing team effectiveness in higher education. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 13(9), 932-940.
- [6] Fransen, J., Weinberger, A., & Kirschner, P. A. (2013). Team effectiveness and team development in CSCL. *Educational psychologist*, 48(1), 9-24.
- [7] Gavrea, C., Ilies, L., & Stegorean, R. (2011). Determinants of organizational performance: The case of Romania. *Management & Marketing*, 6(2).
- [8] Hackman, J. R., & Katz, N. (2010). Group behavior and performance.
- [9] Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2011). Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 96(4), 851.
- [10] Jacobsson, C., Åkerlund, M., Graci, E., Cedstrand, E., & Archer, T. (2016). Teacher Team Effectiveness and Teachers Well-being. *Clin Exp Psychol* 2: 130. doi: 10.4172/2471-2701.1000130 Page 2 of 5 Clin Exp Psychol ISSN: 2471-2701 cep, an open access journal Volume 2• Issue 2• 1000130. The group acts on its decisions. This group encourages high performance and quality work. Table, 1, 3.

- [11] Kleingeld, A., van Mierlo, H., & Arends, L. (2011). The effect of goal setting on group performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 96(6), 1289.
- [12] Latif, K. F., & Williams, N. (2017). Team effectiveness in non-governmental organizations (NGOs) projects. *Evaluation and program planning*, 64, 20-32.
- [13] Logan, T. R. (2016). Influence of Teamwork Behaviors on Workplace Incivility as It Applies to Nurses. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership*, 2(1), 47-53.
- [14] Manzoor, S. R., Ullah, H., Hussain, M., & Ahmad, Z. M. (2011). Effect of teamwork on employee performance. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 1(1), 110-126.
- [15] Mihaiu, D. M., Opreana, A., & Cristescu, M. P. (2010). Efficiency, effectiveness and performance of the public sector. *Romanian Journal of Economic Forecasting*, 4(1), 132-147.
- [16] Moehersono. (2012). *Performance Measurement Based Competency*. Depok: Rajagrafindo Persada.
- [17] Owen, C., (2014). *Human Factors Challenges in Emergency Management: Enhancing Individual and Team Performance in Fire and Emergency Services*
- [18] Salas, E., DiazGranados, D., Klein, C., Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Goodwin, G. F., & Halpin, S. M. (2018). Does team training improve team performance? A meta-analysis. *Human factors*, 50(6), 903-933.
- [19] Sanyal, S., & Hisam, M. W. (2018). The impact of teamwork on work performance of employees: A study of faculty members in Dhofar University. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 20(3), 15-22.
- [20] Starbird, D., & Cavanagh, R., (2010). *Building Engaged Team Performance: Align Your Processes and People to Achieve Game-Changing Business Results*
- [21] Zarraga-Rodriguez, M., Jaca, C., & Viles, E. (2015). Enablers of team effectiveness in higher education: Lecturers' and students' perceptions at an engineering school. *Team Performance Management*.