'TEAM DYNAMICS – AN ESSENTIAL INGREDIENT FOR TEAM SUCCESS'

Dr. Latha Krishnan*

Ms. Ameer Asra Ahmed**

Abstract

This study deals with understanding, the various Group Dynamic factors that the Post-Graduate students such as MBA, MTech, MCA & Medical Electronics generally encounter with special reference to Dayananda Sagar Institutions (DSI). An effort has been made towards studying the different aspects pertaining to Group Dynamics such as Individual Roles played by the Group members, Openness & Confrontation, Cooperation & Conflict, Leadership, Interpersonal relations among the members and Communication patterns in the group during the execution of the projects which can be considered as Group Task. Through this study, it was intended to identify some of the major factors pertaining to Group Dynamics that plays a role in Post-Graduate Student Groups in DSI. Also to determine the factors which negatively and positively contribute towards accomplishment of Group Task and to identify PG students of which discipline most consistently work towards Group Task.

Different Statistical tests were applied to the data collected from the student groups belonging to the above mentioned departments. A sample size of 200 students from MBA, MTech, MCA & Medical Electronics were surveyed and based on the responses the paper was developed. It was found that the students' group dynamics in DSI mainly revolved around 7 factors i.e.

"**Poor Leadership**", "**Group Reticence**", "**Poor Interpersonal Relations**", "**Disorganized group**", "**Dysfunctional Group**", "**Poor Confrontation**" & "**Group Thinking**".

* Director, MBA- Bangalore University, Dayananda Sagar College of Management & Information Technology

** Senior Lecturer, MBA- Bangalore University, Dayananda Sagar College of Management & Information Technology

However, the major significant factor that influenced the Group Dynamics of the students groups across DSI was "**Poor Leadership**" and this was the main hindrance for the groups to accomplish their group task. Apart from the "Poor Leadership" factor there were 3 other factors that were significantly associated with the accomplishment of the group task and team success, i.e. "**Disorganized Group**", "**Dysfunctional Group**" & "**Poor Confrontation**" and this association proved to be a negative one (negative correlation) which implies that the presence of these 4 factors acted as hindrance to the accomplishment of the group task & team success.

1. INTRODUCTION

"More hands make for lighter work." "Two heads are better than one." "The more the merrier." These proverbs speak to the potential groups have to be more productive, creative, and motivated than individuals on their own.

Sitting atop the Shavige hills of DSI, in the canteen, sipping a cup of hot coffee, when one looks over the lush green lawns, it can be captivating to perceive the students sitting in groups, giggling away to glory, s either discussing or criticizing someone who was not around. It was also striking to note that the group behavior was very much dependant on the attitude of the Group Leader. It can also be seen that various groups of students were engrossed in discussions, with books in their hands, pondering over different subjects.

Although for someone who is working in DSI since many years this scene may not be something new but for somebody who has specialized in Organizational Behaviour this can be quite intriguing.

Well, it is but obvious that students have to work in various groups irrespective of the discipline to which they belong. Therefore it can be said that Group Dynamics play a very important role in a student's life.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Group dynamics also includes the field of study within the social sciences that focuses on the nature of groups. Kurt Lewin is commonly identified as the founder of the movement to scientifically study groups. He coined the term group dynamics to describe the way groups and

individuals act and react to changing circumstances. William Schutz (1958) looked at interpersonal relations from the perspective of three dimensions: Inclusion, control, and affection.

One of the aspects is group goal decision making. The use of work groups and teams has become common during the past decades, with approximately 80% of large organizations using work groups (Forsyth, 1999). Working in groups is believed to have a number of potential benefits. Organizations that use work groups and teams are expected to have more involved members (Cohen, 1994; Lawler 1996), establish more challenging goals (Likert, 1961), produce more satisfaction for their members (Forsyth, 1999), and achieve higher levels of performance (Likert, 1961) than organizations that favor individual production. However, research regarding these potential benefits of groups has not always been positive (Hackman, 1990; Robbins & Finley, 1995). Researchers have consistently found that groups rarely establish challenging goals for their own performance (Hinsz, 1991, 1992, 1995).

3. OBJECTIVES

1. To identify some of the major factors contributing to Group Dynamics among the Post-Graduate Student Groups in DSI
2. To determine the factors which negatively and positively contribute towards accomplishment of Group Task and Team success.
3. To gauge PG students of which discipline most consistently work towards Group Task and Team success.

4. HYPOTHESIS

1. There is no significant association between the course to which student groups belongs and the factors of group dynamics.
2. There is no Correlation between factors of Group Dynamics identified and the groups' consistency of achieving group task and Team success.

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research method is a style of conducting research through a scientific procedure. There are several research methods; one of them is the descriptive research or survey method which is used to investigate the present circumstances.

Sampling

A sample size of **200** students from MBA, MTech, MCA & Medical Electronics were surveyed and based on the responses the paper was developed. Convenient and Judgmental sampling was adopted for identifying the respondents.

Tools of Data Analysis

A structured questionnaire was prepared and data collected was analysed using SPSS package.

6. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Through an extensive literature review a set of variables were identified which were then subjected to Reliability Analysis and Factor Analysis. Reliability Test was done to measure the scale reliability with the help of Cronbach alpha which is a coefficient of reliability and is used for measuring the internal consistency among the scale items. The alpha coefficient for the 33 items is **.782**, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency. (Note that a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered "acceptable" in social science research).

Table 6.1 RELIABILTY TEST

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	200	100.0
	Excluded	0	.0
	Total	200	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.782	33

Factor Analysis is a simple statistical test to club together similar variables.

The Communalities table and the Rotated component matrix are as shown below. In the communalities table since the extraction values are greater than 0.5 signifies that the variables selected for factor analysis are significant.

Table 6.2COMMUNALITIES

	Initial	Extraction
Consistently working towards Group Task & success	1.000	.555
You find similarities between u and ur classmates	1.000	.753
You have become friends with class mates bec of GD	1.000	.755
Have u developed positive rapport with friends bec of GD	1.000	.814
GD made you sensitive	1.000	.682
Decisions are reached far too quickly in team leading to team success.	1.000	.613
We have too many people with similar skills	1.000	.799
In our group people r nor allowed to speak-out	1.000	.620
In my group issues are brushed under the carpet	1.000	.735
People are not involved sufficiently in Decision making	1.000	.642
People in groups do not put their true beliefs forward.	1.000	.822
People want to hear what they want to hear rather than truth	1.000	.682
Too many fights & disagreements in the group hindering Team success.	1.000	.706
People are not willing to take others view into account	1.000	.719
We discuss our differences more	1.000	.705
Team Leaders are not trusted	1.000	.746
No team loyalty	1.000	.776
Team Leader does not stand up for members.	1.000	.733
Team leader does not make the best use of members	1.000	.843
Team Leader believes Team members are lazy	1.000	.704
We are frequently having fights/loggerheads with each other	1.000	.728
Groups members are not helpful to one another	1.000	.613
Group members do not understand each other	1.000	.814
Info does not flow freely between members hindering Team success	1.000	.807
Team is not a happy place to work in	1.000	.853
Too many secrets in our group hindering Team success	1.000	.647
There is too little, listening in our group	1.000	.752
GD made me realise my strengths and weaknesses	1.000	.612

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 6.3 TOTAL VARIANCE EXPLAINED

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.480	23.142	23.142	6.480	23.142	23.142	4.329	15.461	15.461
2	3.165	11.303	34.445	3.165	11.303	34.445	3.198	11.422	26.884

3	2.606	9.307	43.752	2.606	9.307	43.752	2.793	9.973	36.857
4	2.520	9.002	52.754	2.520	9.002	52.754	2.707	9.667	46.524
5	2.150	7.680	60.434	2.150	7.680	60.434	2.524	9.014	55.538
6	1.740	6.214	66.648	1.740	6.214	66.648	2.442	8.721	64.260
7	1.569	5.602	72.251	1.569	5.602	72.251	2.237	7.991	72.251
8	1.397	4.991	77.241						
9	1.091	3.895	81.136						
10	.901	3.219	84.355						
11	.765	2.730	87.086						
12	.669	2.389	89.475						
13	.552	1.971	91.445						
14	.485	1.731	93.176						
15	.397	1.419	94.595						
16	.363	1.296	95.891						
17	.294	1.051	96.943						
18	.229	.817	97.760						
19	.160	.570	98.330						
20	.118	.423	98.753						
21	.098	.352	99.104						
22	.076	.271	99.375						
23	.065	.232	99.607						
24	.051	.181	99.788						
25	.025	.091	99.879						
26	.018	.063	99.941						
27	.012	.044	99.985						
28	.004	.015	100.000						

Table 6.4 FACTORS AND FACTOR LOADING

Factors	Name of Dimension	Statements	Factor Loading
F1	*Poor Leadership*	Team leader does not make the best use of members	.900
		Team Leader does not stand up for members.	.825
		No team loyalty	.753
		Team Leader believes Team members are lazy	.733
		In our group people r nor allowed to speak-out	.578

F2	***Group Reticence***	Team is not a happy place to work in	.841
		People in groups do not put their true beliefs forward.	.757
		People want to hear what they want to hear rather than truth	.727
		People are not involved sufficiently in Decision making	0.725
F3	***Poor Interpersonal Relations***	You have become friends with class mates because of GD	.720
		Group members do not understand each other	.705
		Too many secrets in our group	.653
		We are frequently having fights/loggerheads with each other	.652
		Groups members are not helpful to one another	.557
F4	***Disorganized Group***	There is too little, listening in our group	.835
		Info does not flow freely between members	.729
		We have too many people with similar skills	.577
F5	***Dysfunctional Group***	GD made you sensitive	.762
		GD made me realise my strengths and weaknesses	.628
		Too many fights & disagreements in the group	.603
		Team Leaders are not trusted	.576
F6	***Poor Confrontation***	People are not willing to take others view into account	.738
		We discuss our differences more	.737
		In my group issues are brushed under the carpet	.542
F7	***Group Thinking***	You find similarities between u and ur classmates	-.765
		Decisions are reached far too quickly when working in team	-.679
		Have u developed positive rapport with friends because of GD	.577

At the end of Factor Analysis around 7 different factors were identified which could be a part and parcel of every group. It is these factors that constitute the Group Dynamics dimension and which decides the success or failure of every group in achieving their goals. A set of 28 variables were subjected to Factor Analysis and at the end these 28 variables were condensed to 7 factors. The 7 factors identified were "**Poor Leadership**", "**Group Reticence**", "**Poor Interpersonal Relations**", "**Disorganized group**", "**Dysfunctional Group**", "**Poor Confrontation**" & "**Group Thinking**".

Once the Factor Analysis was done, a correlation test was run to determine if there was any significant relation between these 7 factors and the group's consistency towards achieving the group task and Team success. The results of this correlation proved that out of the 7 factors, only 4 were significantly associated with the accomplishment of the group task, i.e. " **Poor Leadership**", "**Disorganized Group**", "**Dysfunctional Group**" & "**Poor Confrontation**" and this association proved to be a negative one (negative correlation) which implies that the presence of these 4 factors acted as hindrance to the accomplishment of the group task & success.

CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GROUPS' CONSISTENCY IN ACHIEVING THE TASK AND THE FACTORS OF GROUP DYNAMICS

Table 6.5 ***Correlation between factors of Group Dynamics identified and the groups' consistency of achieving group task***

	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (1-tailed)
Consistently working towards Group Task	1	
Poor Leadership	**-.344***	**.029**
Group Reticence	-.080	.334
Poor Interpersonal Relations	-.080	.334
Disorganized Group	**-.337***	**.032**

Dysfunctional Group	**-.309***	**.046**
Poor Confrontation	**-.336***	**.032**
Group Thinking	.103	.290

Once the Factor Analysis was done, a correlation test was run to determine if there was any significant relation between these 7 factors and the group's consistency towards achieving the group task and success. The results of this correlation proved that out of the 7 factors, only 4 were significantly associated with the accomplishment of the group task, i.e.

"Poor Leadership", "**Disorganized Group**", "**Dysfunctional Group**" & "**Poor Confrontation**" and this association proved to be a negative one (negative correlation) which implies that the presence of these 4 factors acted as hindrance to the accomplishment of the group task and success.

From the above table, it is evident that, at 5% significance level (95% confidence level), **"Poor Leadership"**, "**Disorganized Group**", "**Dysfunctional Group**" & "**Poor Confrontation**" have a negative correlation with the group's consistency in achieving the task. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

This indicates that any group of students working collectively in DSI will find it difficult to work towards the Group Task if:

1. The Group Leader lacks the required leadership skills

- When the Group leader is not prepared to stand up for his team.
- When the leader does not involve the team members into the task.
- When the leader believes that the group members are inherently lazy and are not serious about completing the task.
- When the leader is unapproachable or the members are not encouraged to put forward their ideas when working in a group.

2. The group is Unorganized

- Right people for the right job at the right time are not selected during the formation of the group or if a group consists of too many people with similar skills.

- The group members are not transparent with each other or there is no proper system to share information freely with one another.
- The group members lack proper listening skills.

3. The group is Dysfunctional in nature

- The group members are constantly at loggerheads with each other and lack co-operation.
- The group members spend time analyzing themselves and others rather than focusing on the task to be completed.
- The team members do not trust the leader or think that the leader is biased.

4. The Group members lack confrontation abilities

- The group members may have lots of differences with each other which they feel reluctant to open up to one another and as a result they feel frustrated inside.
- When the issues arising in the group are just brushed away without confronting those issues. Therefore issues can build to a large extent and remain unresolved.
- The Group members lack the ability to empathize with each other and most of the time refuse to take other members' views into account.

Apart from these 4 factors there are other 3 factors i.e. **"Group Reticence","Poor Interpersonal Relations", and "Group Thinking"** which also share a negative association with the team working towards the task however these factors are not significantly affecting the group's ability to achieve the task and success.

CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COURSES TO WHICH STUDENTS BELONG AND THE FACTORS OF GROUP DYNAMICS

Table 6.6 ***Correlation between courses to which Student Groups belong and the factors of Group Dynamics***

Table 6.6 ANOVA (*course to which student group belongs)*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Poor Leadership	**Between Groups**	**12.708**	**3**	**4.236**	**4.914**	**.007**
	Within Groups	**23.274**	**27**	**.862**		
	Total	**35.982**	**30**			
Group Reticence	Between Groups	.622	3	.207	.194	.900
	Within Groups	28.933	27	1.072		
	Total	29.556	30			
Poor Interpersonal Relations	Between Groups	3.403	3	1.134	1.367	.274
	Within Groups	22.401	27	.830		
	Total	25.804	30			
Disorganized Group	Between Groups	1.389	3	.463	.374	.772
	Within Groups	33.400	27	1.237		
	Total	34.789	30			
Dysfunctional Group	Between Groups	2.421	3	.807	1.436	.254
	Within Groups	15.175	27	.562		
	Total	17.597	30			
Poor Confrontation	Between Groups	3.327	3	1.109	1.257	.309
	Within Groups	23.827	27	.882		
	Total	27.154	30			
Group Thinking	Between Groups	.931	3	.310	1.196	.330
	Within Groups	7.005	27	.259		
	Total	7.935	30			

One way analysis of variance has been used to find the significant association between the course to which student belongs and the factors of group dynamics, as shown in the above table.

From the above table, it is evident that, at 5% significance level (95% confidence level), the course to which student belongs and only one factor of group dynamics i.e. Poor Leadership has significant association (significant value is **.007**). This means that, students of different courses have different expectations from their leaders. Therefore the Null Hypothesis was rejected.

Table 6.7 DESCRIPTIVES

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Poor Leadership	MBA	7	2.20	1.390	.526	.91	3.49	1	5
	MTech	7	3.86	.957	.362	2.97	4.74	2	5
	MCA	11	2.82	.690	.208	2.35	3.28	2	4
	Medical electronics	6	3.70	.533	.218	3.14	4.26	3	4
	Total	31	3.08	1.095	.197	2.68	3.49	1	5

From the above descriptive table, it can be determined that out of the 4 courses that have been considered in this study, student groups from MTech and Medical Electronics are the ones that really have major grievances against their group leaders. However, MCA and MBA student groups seem to have minimal grievances against their group leaders.

Miscellaneous Group Dynamic variables and their association with the Course to which Student Groups belongs

Apart from the 7 factors of Group dimension there are a few other variables of Group Dynamics which have a significant association with the Course to which the student groups belong. They are as shown in the figure below:

Table 6.8 ANOVA (course to which the student group belongs)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Consistently working towards Group Task	Between Groups	11.671	3	3.890	6.164	**.002**
	Within Groups	17.039	27	.631		
	Total	28.710	30			
Decisions are reached quickly when working in team leading to success of the team.	Between Groups	7.250	3	2.417	3.656	**.025**
	Within Groups	17.846	27	.661		
	Total	25.097	30			
In my group issues are brushed under the carpet	Between Groups	9.343	3	3.114	2.413	**.089**
	Within Groups	34.851	27	1.291		
	Total	44.194	30			
Too many fights & disagreements in the group	Between Groups	13.014	3	4.338	3.275	**.036**
	Within Groups	35.760	27	1.324		
	Total	48.774	30			
Team Leaders are not trusted	Between Groups	14.123	3	4.708	2.914	**.052**
	Within Groups	43.619	27	1.616		
	Total	57.742	30			
Team Leader does not stand up for members.	Between Groups	27.582	3	9.194	9.397	**.000**
	Within Groups	26.418	27	.978		
	Total	54.000	30			
Team leader does not make the best use of members	Between Groups	14.742	3	4.914	3.161	**.041**
	Within Groups	41.968	27	1.554		
	Total	56.710	30			
Info does not flow freely between members hindering team success.	Between Groups	18.621	3	6.207	3.467	**.030**
	Within Groups	48.346	27	1.791		
	Total	66.968	30			

Table 6.9 Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
Consistently working towards Group Task & Team success.	MBA	50	4.86	.378	.143	4.51	5.21	4	5
	MTech	50	4.00	.816	.309	3.24	4.76	3	5
	MCA	50	4.27	.647	.195	3.84	4.71	3	5
	Medical electronics	50	**3.00**	1.265	.516	1.67	4.33	1	4
	Total	200	4.10	.978	.176	3.74	4.46	1	5
Decisions are reached quickly when working in team leading to success of the team.	MBA	50	**4.29**	.756	.286	3.59	4.98	3	5
	MTech	50	3.86	.900	.340	3.03	4.69	3	5
	MCA	50	3.55	.688	.207	3.08	4.01	2	4
	Medical electronics	50	2.83	.983	.401	1.80	3.87	2	4
	Total	200	3.65	.915	.164	3.31	3.98	2	5
In my group issues are brushed under the carpet	MBA	50	2.57	.976	.369	1.67	3.47	1	4
	MTech	50	**4.00**	1.528	.577	2.59	5.41	1	5
	MCA	50	2.82	.751	.226	2.31	3.32	2	4
	Medical electronics	50	3.50	1.378	.563	2.05	4.95	1	5
	Total	200	3.16	1.214	.218	2.72	3.61	1	5
Too many fights & disagreements in the group hampering team success.	MBA	50	2.14	1.069	.404	1.15	3.13	1	4
	MTech	50	**3.86**	1.069	.404	2.87	4.85	2	5
	MCA	50	**3.64**	1.120	.338	2.88	4.39	2	5
	Medical electronics	50	**3.50**	1.378	.563	2.05	4.95	2	5
	Total	200	3.32	1.275	.229	2.85	3.79	1	5
Team Leaders are not trusted	MBA	50	3.14	1.864	.705	1.42	4.87	1	5
	MTech	50	**4.71**	.488	.184	4.26	5.17	4	5
	MCA	50	3.00	1.095	.330	2.26	3.74	2	5
	Medical electronics	50	3.33	1.366	.558	1.90	4.77	1	5
	Total	200	3.48	1.387	.249	2.97	3.99	1	5
Team Leader does not stand up for members.	MBA	50	1.86	1.069	.404	.87	2.85	1	4
	MTech	50	**4.00**	.816	.309	3.24	4.76	3	5
	MCA	50	2.45	1.128	.340	1.70	3.21	1	4
	Medical electronics	50	**4.17**	.753	.307	3.38	4.96	3	5
	Total	200	3.00	1.342	.241	2.51	3.49	1	5
Team leader does not make the best use of members	MBA	50	1.86	1.574	.595	.40	3.31	1	5
	MTech	50	**3.71**	1.496	.565	2.33	5.10	1	5
	MCA	50	2.73	1.009	.304	2.05	3.41	1	4

	Medical electronics	50	**3.50**	.837	.342	2.62	4.38	2	4
	Total	200	2.90	1.375	.247	2.40	3.41	1	5
Info does not flow freely between members hindering team success.	MBA	50	2.29	1.380	.522	1.01	3.56	1	5
	MTech	50	**4.14**	1.464	.553	2.79	5.50	1	5
	MCA	50	2.45	.934	.282	1.83	3.08	1	4
	Medical electronics	50	3.67	1.751	.715	1.83	5.50	1	5

7. FINDINGS

1. From the above ANOVA table and the below Descriptives table it can be known that student groups belonging to MBA, MCA & MTech work much more consistently towards the group task and team success when compared to Medical Electronics.

2. The student groups of MBA tend to take much hasty decisions pertaining to their group task and team success when compared to MCA & MTech. However Medical Electronic students take unusually excessive time to reach any decision.

3. Fights & Disagreements are much higher in MCA, MTech and Medical Electronics as compared to MBA and therefore MTech and Medical Electronic students tend to keep such arguments hidden from the faculty however MBA and MCA student groups prefer Faculty intervention. Therefore, the team success is much higher among MBA students when compared to MCA, MTech and Medical Electronics.

4. It was found that in MTech and MCA student groups, not only have disagreements on the higher side but they also seem to be very much unhappy with their group leaders, hindering team success when compared to MCA and MBA course student groups.

5. The MTech and Medical Electronic students do not seem to be having trust in their leaders as they feel that their leaders do not stand up for the team when any issue arises nor do they uniformly distribute the work among the members hindering team success. However MBA & MCA students are comparatively happy with their group leaders.

6. Lastly, when any task is being executed it is highly essential, that all group members are involved and briefed regularly about the progress of the task, but as per the information obtained,

the MTech students to a large extent and Medical Electronics to some extent seem a little disappointed in the way things are being communicated to them hindering team success. They feel that they lack a proper communication channel through which they can be updated about the progress pertaining to the task.

8. CONCLUSION

This study gives an in depth insight into the group dynamics of the students belonging the 4 main PG courses in Dayananda Sagar Institutions i.e. MBA, MCA, MTech & Medical Electronics. As mentioned earlier in the study, that is essential for a student to work in groups not only because group projects and team assignments are a part of their academic curriculum but also because there is a lot of teaching and learning that takes place when students work in groups. Unless the students, learn to work in teams they will surely find it difficult to gel in the corporate culture where team spirit is the key to winning accolades. Based on the faculty experiences of the above said departments, it was observed that the MBA student groups were the least glitchy and most consistently worked towards the group task and Medical Electronics Students groups were found to be most difficult in accomplishing the group task within the deadline. Moreover, in terms of the fights and disagreements among the student groups across the 4 departments, it was observed that the MTech students seemed to have more fights among the group members followed by the MCA, then Medical Electronics and the least fighting group was MBA. It was also found that the MTech students had the maximum problems with their leaders, followed by the Medical Electronic Students. The MBA and MCA students however did not seem to have much problems with the leaders of their groups. A leader should be someone who needs to be an all-rounder in the group, and has to be a strong team player. He should be honest, should have the ability to delegate the right work to the right group member, should be a good communicator, a strong motivator, be confident and committed, possess a positive attitude at all times, be creative and passionate; while retaining a good sense of humour. He should have the ability to inspire all the members to collectively work towards nothing short of excellence. When questioned about how the students came together to form a group, it was found that in MTech, MCA and Medical Electronics, the friends came together to be a part of the same group without interference from their faculty however, in MBA the student groups were officially formed by the respective faculty rather than by the students themselves. Therefore in terms of organization the MBA

groups were found to be much more organized with diverse skills as compared to MTech, MCA and Medical Electronic.

Disagreements are something that occurs in every team, however it is essential that the group members confront the disagreements and sort it out mutually and that's exactly being done by the MTech student groups and therefore they are much better in accomplishing the group tasks as compared to Medical Electronic students. The Medical Electronic students tend to lack confrontation skills due to which the fights and conflicts in Medical Electronic groups is much lesser compared to MTech, but this in turn led to a more complicated issue of not achieving the group task hampering team success. Disagreements are inevitable, however it is essential that the group members confront the disagreements and sort it out mutually. But mainly the success of any team is in the hands of the team leader, who needs to be fair & unbiased. The leader should play a central role in any group & irrespective of the size of the group or the attitude of the group members involve every member in the task and stand by the team no matter what the circumstances. Through this study some ingredients of Group dynamics were identified which are essential of the Team's success. They are:

1. Having a Good Leader (Good Leadership)

2. Group member involvement (Avoidance of Group Reticence)

3. Good Interpersonal relations among team members

4. Having an organized group (Group formation and selection of members should be done appropriately)

5. Having a Functional group where group members feel free to confront each other in a constructive way (group members should have Functional Conflicts which are more constructive towards building stronger group dynamics rather than Dysfunctional conflicts which are more prone to harm the group relations.)

6. Groupthink can fatally undermine group decision making. A Group should never a allow Groupthink to seep into it.

REFERENCES

1. Aarestad, B. J., & Moewes, D. S. (2004). Incorporating learning styles into team-based learning. Paper presented at the SUN Conference on Teaching and Learning, University of Texas, El Paso, March.

2. Abrami, P., Chambers, P. C., Poulson, C., Howden, J., d Appolonia, D., De Simone, C., et al. (1993). Using cooperative learning Montreal: Concordia University: Centre for the Study of Classroom Processes.

3. Baker, D. F., & Campbell, C. M. (2005). When is there strength in numbers? A study of undergraduate student groups College Teaching, 53 (1), 14 – 18.