Quantifying the "Softer Side" of Management Education: An Example Using Teamwork Competencies
Terry R. Halfhill and Tjai M. Nielsen
Journal of Management Education 2007; 31; 64
DOI: 10.1177/1052562906287777

The online version of this article can be found at: http://jme.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/31/1/64

Published by:
SAGE Publications
http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:
Organizational Behavior Teaching Society

Additional services and information for Journal of Management Education can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://jme.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts
Subscriptions: http://jme.sagepub.com/subscriptions
Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav
Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations (this article cites 14 articles hosted on the SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
http://jme.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/31/1/64
QUANTIFYING THE “SOFTER SIDE”
OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION:
AN EXAMPLE USING TEAMWORK
COMPETENCIES
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Tjai M. Nielsen
The George Washington University

During the past 5 years, we have reexamined what we teach in management education, placing a much stronger emphasis on interpersonal skills than in the past. We must now reexamine how we teach these skills and demonstrate their value quantitatively. This article presents one method of quantifying the “softer side” of management education. It provides instruction and resources for educators and organizational professionals to administer, analyze, score, and provide quality feedback on virtually any competency area. The method is developmental in that it identifies individual, group, and organizational strengths and developmental opportunities. It is also an effective method of demonstrating the value of “soft skills” to students.
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The perceived value of a business education is in decline (Rynes, Trank, Lawson, & Ilies, 2003), despite a significant increase in the number of MBA degrees awarded in the past 20 years (The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business [AACSB] Newsline, 1999). Although empirical data is sparse regarding the impact business schools have on their graduates or the profession of management, data that are available suggest that business schools are not very effective. For example, Pfeffer and Fong (2002) found MBA course grades and the MBA degree unrelated to career success. In addition, there is little evidence suggesting that research emanating from these programs influences management practice. Perhaps one source attributable to this decline involves the perception that business school graduates lack the
interpersonal skills employers demand (Alsop, 2002). In addition, several disciplines within business have identified interpersonal skills as a key developmental area for curriculum, such as accounting and finance (Milne, 2001).

In addition to business, the engineering field has identified a similar shortcoming. The Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology (ABET) has determined that as of 2001, undergraduate education must include teaching students to function in multidisciplinary teams and to communicate effectively (Farr & Bowman, 1999). Since this announcement, several business and engineering programs require students to work together in multiple courses to develop teamwork skills prior to graduation (see for example Auburn University, Lehigh University, Stanford University, University of Tennessee–Knoxville).

Perceived Value of “Soft Skills”

Soft skills are essentially interpersonal skills used in one-to-one and one-to-group settings. Examples of soft skills include communication, conflict resolution, and the ability to give and receive feedback effectively, as well as more complex attributes such as emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995; Law, Wong, & Song, 2004). An individual’s ability to effectively deploy these skills in the workplace benefits the individual as well as the company. One study of 968 firms representing all major industries in the United States found that companies with managers who demonstrate effective management skills have lower turnover, increased profits, higher sales per employee, and increased stock market value (Huselid, 1995; Pfeffer & Veiga, 1999). Despite the fact that these skills affect personal and organizational outcomes and that universities value curriculum emphasizing interpersonal skills, students often fail to see the benefit.

An AACSB (1997) benchmarking study of exiting MBA graduates revealed that management and organizational behavior courses were seen as lacking value and receiving too much emphasis. However, it has been our experience as educators that students sometimes “don’t know what they don’t know.” That is, students do not always understand the importance of motivation, relationship building, and emotional intelligence until later in their career. In fact, an alumni study of the same full-time MBA graduates from the 1997 study (AACSB, 2003) completed 5 years later found that management and business communications classes were seen as the most important classes contributing to career success.

Making the Connection

How then, do we as educators convey the importance of these skills to our younger students? One strategy might involve measuring a particular
set of soft skills and demonstrating quantitatively how they affect particular outcomes such as performance and effectiveness. This strategy works well when we teach courses such as accounting and finance where certain techniques are shown to save time and/or money. Students rarely question the value of these types of tools. Perhaps quantifying the value of soft skills by linking them directly to relevant outcomes may help change perceptions.

TEAMWORK AS AN EXAMPLE

Formal training on teamwork skills is often underappreciated by students. One account by a student referred to teams and teamwork as a fad that does not change how work actually gets done (Dean, Brandes, & Dharwadkar, 1998). Not only does it appear that formal teamwork training is taken for granted, many students believe they already possess adequate levels of teamwork skills. For example, a teamwork knowledge, skills, and abilities test was administered to a group of 62 undergraduate business and engineering students (Halfhill, 2002). The average score on the test was 46%. However, when the same students were asked, “What is your current level of proficiency regarding teamwork,” all responded medium to very high. No differences were found between disciplines: Both business and engineering students failed.

There are several additional reasons why teamwork is an appropriate competency to use as an example of measuring soft skills. First, the increasing use of teams in industry simply cannot be ignored; virtually everyone in the workforce works as a team member at some point in their career (Lawler, Mohrman, Cohen, & Ledford, 1998; Nielsen, Sundstrom, & Halfhill, 2005). Second, it is a topic relevant to most professions but of considerable importance to both business professionals and engineers given the recent attention to the topic in undergraduate curriculum. Many students and working professionals believe they are good team members without formal training and that these skills can be acquired without help. Finally, teamwork competencies are used in this example because most of the courses in our program (and many others like it) utilize teams in many upper level courses.

To derive the particular teamwork competencies used, we first incorporated the competencies prescribed by ABET. These competencies included communication, holding effective team meetings, and the ability to effectively work as a member of a project team. Stevens and Campion (1994) also identified five major teamwork competency areas, including (a) planning and task coordination, (b) goal setting and performance management, (c) conflict resolution, (d) communications, and (e) collaborative problem solving.

In addition to the competencies outlined above, research has demonstrated that certain personality traits tend to predict team effectiveness. Specifically, agreeableness tends to promote smooth group interactions (Halfhill, Nielsen, Sundstrom, & Weilbaecher, 2005; Neuman & Wright,
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1999), conscientiousness aids with task accomplishment (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998), and extroversion facilitates boundary spanning—the ability of the group to seek and acquire resources external to the group (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992).

Although personality traits are not typically thought of as malleable, they have an impact on group functioning and are valuable from an individual differences perspective. That is, when team members are aware that their behavior has a negative impact on the group, they or their team leader may adjust (e.g., disagreeable team members may choose not to facilitate group meetings or a team leader may assign tasks to a team member low in conscientious that are not particularly crucial to the group outcome).

The purpose of this article is to share one method of quantifying the “softer side” of virtually any management course using teamwork as an example. The method we present is also very useful for organizations and professionals working in human resources. A fairly simple yet robust procedure is presented for demonstrating the relevance and predictive validity of “soft skills,” including sections on data analysis, report generation, and use of feedback for developmental purposes in classrooms or organizations. The article concludes with a discussion regarding potential methodological benefits.

Overview

The general method described in this article utilizes statistical process control techniques similar to those presented by Deming (1981), applied to behavioral competencies. The process lends itself well to the use of survey data: specifically, peer feedback in classroom environments and 360-degree feedback in organizational contexts. It also works nicely with either Web-based data collection or more traditional paper-and-pencil administrations. The process is somewhat time-consuming to develop and administer but relatively “hands-off” after initial development.

CHOOSING THE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

Virtually any skill set within the organizational behavior framework may be used. In fact, if a competency can be measured, it can be used with this method. It is recommended that instructors begin with a scale, or set of scales that have demonstrated adequate reliability and validity. The competency areas assessed should focus on skills taught in class.

Survey format. Peer feedback instruments typically provide feedback from the perspective of peers or teammates, whereas 360-degree feedback instruments provide feedback from peers, subordinates, superiors, and often the individuals themselves. In this example, it was important to contrast
individual perceptions with peer perceptions, resulting in a modified peer feedback instrument.

To make direct comparisons across survey questions and survey scales, it is important to measure the same content in both versions of the survey (self-report and peer ratings). To accomplish this, a peer rating survey was created and then modified to measure self-perceptions.

**Team effectiveness form.** In addition to measuring the competencies of importance, it is necessary to measure group effectiveness. Group effectiveness includes both group performance and viability (see Appendix A for items). Group viability is defined as “a future oriented property of the group that includes continuity (ability to maintain a core group membership), commitment (to a shared group purpose), cohesion, and capability (to accomplish the shared purpose)” (Halfhill & Huff, 2004). An accepted definition of group viability has only recently been fashioned (Halfhill & Huff, 2004), resulting in a paucity of available measures.

**ADMINISTRATION**

Administering the instrument can be a relatively simple procedure (paper-and-pencil version) or more complex (Web-based survey with real-time feedback capabilities). A paper-and-pencil version is suggested to begin with, especially if using new scales. This will allow scale reliabilities and validity coefficients to stabilize. It is easier to produce a Web-based version once the survey is finalized and feedback procedures have been established. A clear vision of the instrument and feedback report will make the task of creating a Web version less complex.¹

Surveys should be completed twice each semester, near the beginning once teams have had the opportunity to work together, and toward the end near the completion of group projects. Participants should be exposed to the instrument, how it is to be completed, why it is necessary to complete, and the benefits they will receive from the feedback prior to administration. They should also be informed of how the results of the instrument will be used and who will have access to the data.

**Data Analysis**

It is recommended that three separate data sets be maintained, one each for self-report data, peer ratings, and group effectiveness data. The data sets can easily be merged when necessary. There are six major components to data analysis, including self-report scale averages, peer ratings, team averages, upper and lower control limits, written comments, and group effectiveness ratings.
Self-report. The self-report data set will include one entry for each student and/or employee. The average of each set of scale items (e.g., the five conflict resolution items) will depend on scaling (e.g., Likert scales ranging from 1 to 5, or 1 to 7). It is necessary to calculate the average for each scale.

Peer ratings. Peer ratings consist of average ratings for each scale provided by all team members for the person being rated.²

Team averages. Team averages are composed of all peer ratings for a team. If a team has five members, each member has four peer ratings and the team’s average for each competency is based on 20 peer ratings. Self-report averages are purposely excluded because of potential bias, as well as some empirical evidence asserting that peers provide more accurate ratings (Murphy & Cleveland, 1992; Saavedra & Kwun, 1993).

Control limits. A major component of statistical process control is the use of control limits to identify when, in this case, behavior is “out of control.” To compute the upper and lower control limits, calculate the overall average for each competency. This typically involves aggregating the average competency score (aggregate peer rating) of every student and/or employee in the data set. It is also necessary to compute the standard deviation for each competency. The upper control limit is the mean for the competency (e.g., conflict resolution) plus one standard deviation, and the lower control limit is the mean minus one standard deviation. Because the mean plus or minus one standard deviation is equal to two standard deviations, this method essentially identifies the middle 68.26% of the score distribution, leaving roughly 30% of the distribution (15%) above and (15%) below the mean. Individuals that score at or below the lower control limit fall into the bottom 15% of scores, which means their performance for that competency, as rated by peers, was well below standard. Similarly, if an individual’s competency is rated at or above the upper control limit, then he or she is performing well above average.

Control limits equal to one standard deviation away from the mean are used here for illustrative purposes, and it should be noted that they could be easily adjusted simply by changing the standard deviation. For example, it is possible to set the upper control limit to one standard deviation above the mean, and the lower control limit to 1/2 standard deviation below the mean. In effect, this would raise the bar for minimum levels of competency. Determining control limits is a personal decision made by the instructor. Using one standard deviation above and below the mean is easy for students to grasp, and useful in terms of identifying the top and bottom 15%.

Group effectiveness. To compute group effectiveness ratings it is necessary to aggregate both performance and viability ratings.³ Because each team member is providing his or her perceptions of how well the team performs,
and how viable the team may be in the future, it is a good idea to check for agreement among team members to justify aggregation. Two commonly used statistics for determining whether it is appropriate to aggregate individual responses to the team level are the intraclass correlation coefficient, or ICC (James, 1982), and $R_{wg}$ (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984). Others have also used the eta-squared statistic.

**Report Generation**

Generating reports for a medium-sized class of 20 to 30 students will initially take several hours. However, the more familiar one is with computerized database programs, the more likely the time commitment will decrease. Graduate students are usually very skilled at using these software programs and can be very helpful in the initial development, data analysis, and report generation stages.

The most effective way to present the data to students is via a line chart using Microsoft Excel (Microsoft Office Suite, 1985). Sample charts are presented in Figure 1. It is possible to make two charts, separating personal feedback from team feedback.

*Self-/peer/team feedback report.* This report is the main source of visual feedback for students. It includes information on self- and peer ratings for

---

Figure 1: Self-, Peer, and Team Ratings Report
each of the competencies measured, as well as feedback on how the team performed relative to all of the other teams in the sample. A more detailed explanation of how to interpret the feedback is presented in the feedback and interpretation section below.

**Continuous self-portrait/team portrait.** This is an optional report, not discussed in detail in this article, but deserving mention for those interested. The purpose of this report is to document either individual or team progress over time. Simply create a line chart and substitute Time 1 and Time 2 peer ratings, or Time 1 and Time 2 team performance, between the upper and lower control limits. This will enable the individual and the team to track progress over time and is especially helpful when used in conjunction with Individual Development Plans (Huet-Cox, Nielsen, & Sundstrom, 1999). Some instructors may ask students to work on competency areas at or below the lower control limit.

**Written comments feedback report.** The easiest way to create this form is to cut and paste the written comments onto a preformatted Microsoft Word (Microsoft Office Suite, 1985) document. However, this can become quite time-consuming as class size increases. A much more efficient method involves the use of Microsoft Access (Microsoft Office Suite, 1985). With the help of this program, thousands of written comments feedback reports can be generated in a few minutes.

**Team effectiveness report.** Because these data are group level, a correlation matrix of all variables is an effective way to display relationships among variables. The use of scatter plots between key variables also helps show students and/or employees the strength of relationships among key variables. One general report is created and a copy is attached to each individual team member’s report.

To summarize, once the instrument is developed and the data analyzed, it is necessary to compile feedback reports for students and/or employees. Generating reports can be time-consuming, but automating many of the basic processes using software packages can eliminate 90% of the time involved. Recommendations for generating these reports are outlined above.

**Feedback and Interpretation**

It is a good idea to set aside an hour or two to help students and/or employees interpret their feedback. It is also beneficial to create a handout or Web site to aid with interpretation. Because feedback is presented at the individual,
group, and organizational levels of analysis, it is useful to cover the information in that order. Operationally defining each competency ensures a shared understanding among students. This helps decrease rater error and gives students an idea of what to expect when the feedback reports are generated.

It is important to note that the example in this article used a 1 to 5 Likert scale, where 1 indicates poor performance and 5 indicates high performance. This scale applies to all competencies except extroversion. Extroversion should not be interpreted as “good” or “bad” at the individual level, but groups that score very low in extroversion run the risk of not seeking and obtaining resources external to the group. This distinction should be made clear before proceeding with the following reports.

**Self-/peer/team ratings report.** The purpose of this report is to allow students and/or employees to make multiple comparisons and “benchmark” their level of proficiency with respect to peers and the team as a whole. The first comparison to highlight is between self-report and peer data. Salient questions include the following: (a) How did you rate yourself across all of the competencies? (b) Did you rate yourself very high or very low on any one competency? (c) Did your teammates rate you very high or very low on any of the competencies? (d) Are there any significant differences between your self-ratings and peer ratings? If so, would you consider them blind spots (e.g., Is this new to you, or did you realize that you needed to work on competency “X”)? (e) Do you agree with your peer evaluation? Why or why not? Having students answer these questions in written form as an assignment encourages them to analyze the data and reflect on the process.

The next comparison to point out is between peer ratings and team averages. Here, important questions may include the following: (a) Where are your peer ratings with respect to the team average? (b) Are you consistently above or below the team average? Individuals who are above the team average for a particular competency may be seen as assets to the group; individuals who are below the team’s average for a particular competency may be seen as liabilities to the group.

In our experience, framing the feedback session with these questions helps students see the impact of their individual behavior on group processes and outcomes. Most important, they begin to see that these soft skills are important.

**Team feedback report.** This report allows team members to directly compare their team with high and low performers in the class or program or organization. Explaining the concept of control limits is important, and depending on the situation, it may also be helpful to refresh team members’ memory of standard deviation relative to the normal distribution curve. Explain that roughly 70% of teams score between the upper control limit (UCL) and lower control limit (LCL). It is then apparent that if their team approaches or
extends beyond either control limit, they can get a pretty good idea of how their team is performing relative to other teams. If they approach or extend beyond the UCL, they are in the top 15% of all teams, and if they approach or extend beyond the LCL, they are in the bottom 15% of all teams.

**Written comments.** Written comments allow team members to express feelings and ideas about team member behavior that may have been omitted from the survey. Including open-ended statements that invite feedback is a crucial part of the process. Often, students and employees are not fully aware of the impact their behavior has on others and are not always convinced by data alone. Written comments can be useful in providing a context for feedback and helping individuals better understand the implications of their data. Consider the following self-report and peer comments provided to an individual in an undergraduate management development course. Two developmental areas were identified that focused on his low conscientious score and ineffective listening skills. He asked me if the data listed on his report were correct, if perhaps I made a mistake or inadvertently switched his data with someone else. His self-report comments make no mention of low conscientiousness but do address the ineffective listening skills. Each of his team members identified both as areas for development.

**Example of Written Comments**

**SELF-REPORT**

I am an asset to my team because . . .
- I like to think I make the group atmosphere exciting.
- I am actively involved in any group discussion and I constantly offer my opinion.

I could help my team more by . . .
- I could use a little work on my listening skills.
- I tend to wander off the subject and get easily distracted.

**PEER COMMENTS**

You are an asset to our team because . . .
- you add a lot of comments and thoughts to the group discussions.
- you express your opinions and hear out what other people have to say.
- always brings a different perspective to the group.
- he does not mind if attention is all on him. He is very outgoing.
- when it comes to speaking in front of a class, he does not mind.

You could help our team more if . . .
- you were to show up to the meetings and planning sessions that we have scheduled.
although you may hear out the person’s opinions, you should try to be more accepting of their viewpoints.

by coming to all of the group meetings and be more prepared about the knowledge on the group’s information on the project.

when we first started meeting for the student project, he was there. We are not meeting for the corporate project and he has not shown up for one class. He needs to show up for meetings.

**Team effectiveness report.** The purpose of this report is to demonstrate that teamwork competencies are directly associated with team effectiveness. We recommend keeping a team effectiveness database, aggregating team data over time. Analyses from the larger database can be used to show relationships between teamwork competencies and team effectiveness. This overall report should be supplemented with analyses from current data, and can be displayed using regression, correlation matrices, and scatter plots.

## Discussion and Conclusion

Many of us in management education continually assess what we teach and have subsequently put a stronger emphasis on interpersonal skills. It is
time we reexamined how we teach these skills and attempt to demonstrate their value quantitatively. Successful incorporation of soft skills may be only as effective as our ability to demonstrate their value.

This article presents one method of quantifying the “softer side” of management education. It provides instruction and resources for educators and organizational professionals to design, administer, analyze, score, and provide quality feedback on virtually any competency area. The method we employ is developmental in that it identifies individual, group, and organizational strengths and weaknesses with respect to competencies. It is also effective in demonstrating the relationship between interpersonal skills and group effectiveness.

From a broader perspective, this system can be used across departments, colleges, and universities for benchmarking purposes. MBA programs could easily be compared on competencies of interest, and the effectiveness of instruction could be more readily assessed.

In summary, employers now seek graduates that are both technically sound and interpersonally savvy. To meet these requirements, we must successfully incorporate the training of interpersonal skills into our curricula. Successfully incorporating these skills ultimately involves demonstrating that these skills matter—that they are important, and that organizations staffed with employees that possess high levels of both technical proficiency and interpersonal skill have a distinct competitive advantage.

Appendix A

Group Effectiveness Scale

Group Viability

1. Members of the team would request assignment to the same team in the future.
2. All members demonstrate loyalty to the team.
3. All members demonstrate strong commitment to the team.
4. Personality conflicts are rare within work group.
5. This group handles conflict among members quickly and smoothly.
6. Members of this group have very friendly relationships.
7. Members of this group show great harmony with one another.
8. Being a member of this group meets members’ social needs.
9. Belonging to this group causes frustration for some members.
10. Rarely do members of this group have to sacrifice their individual goals to achieve group goals.
11. Members can achieve individual goals by working toward group goals.
12. Some of this group’s goals conflict with individual members’ goals.
13. This is a very cohesive group.
14. Members of this team enjoy working with one another.
Group Performance

1. This group understands how to accomplish its tasks.
2. This group meets all objectives for work completed.
3. This group’s work is always of the highest quality.
4. This group takes initiative in solving problems and decision making.
5. This group is very good at planning how to accomplish their work objectives.

SPSS Syntax Used to Compute Peer Ratings

Make sure the “outfile” line specifies the folder you want the aggregate data to be stored in. The “break” line specifies which variable to group by, in this case it uses last name but can be changed to any variable in your data set.

AGGREGATE
/OUTFILE = 'C:\desktop\peer ratings.sav'
/BREAK = last_name
/conscientious_1 = MEAN(conscientious) /agreeable_1 = MEAN(agreeable)
/extroversion_1 = MEAN(extroversion) /conflictresolution_1 = MEAN(conflictresolution)
/collabprobsolve_1 = MEAN(collabprobsolve)
/communication_1 = MEAN(communication) /goalsetting_1 = MEAN(goalsetting)
/plantaskcoord _1 = MEAN(plantaskcoord) /meetmgtskls_1 = MEAN(meetmgtskls).
/EXECUTE

Appendix B

Teamwork Competency Instrument

The following instrument can be modified to fit self-report and peer evaluations.

SELF-REPORT HEADER

As a team member, I believe that I . . .

PEER RATINGS HEADER

To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding your personal interaction with the person you are rating while working together . . .

Personal Style

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS

Is always prepared.
Makes plans and sticks to them.
Can always be counted on to follow through with what they say.
Consistently does more than what is expected of them.
Is meticulous about every little detail.
AGREEABLENESS
Respects others regardless of differences.
Believes most people have good intentions.
Accepts people as they are.
Is a very forgiving and understanding person.
Attempts to see something positive in everyone.

EXTROVERSION
Does not mind drawing attention to themselves.
Usually has a lot to say.
Appears to be very comfortable around other people.
Appears to make friends easily with other team members.
Contributes as much as they possibly can to the group.

Teamwork Competencies

CONFLICT RESOLUTION
Recognizes and encourages desirable conflict.
Discourages undesirable conflict.
Employs win-win negotiation strategies as opposed to win-lose.
Has good relationships with all team members.
Confronts others skillfully.

COLLABORATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING
Identifies situations requiring participative group problem-solving skills.
Recognizes obstacles to group problem solving and takes corrective action.
Encourages the use of different techniques for problem solving, such as brainstorming, voting, and each member presenting his or her best idea.
Encourages all group members to participate in group decisions.
Ensures 100% consensus on group decisions.

COMMUNICATIONS
Understands decentralized communication networks, uses them to enhance communication.
Uses supportive communication that focuses on the behavior, not the individual.
Listens nonevaluatively.
Uses active listening techniques.
Effectively utilizes nonverbal language.
Is able to interpret nonverbal cues from other team members.

GOAL SETTING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
Helps establish specific, challenging, and accepted team goals.
Monitors and provides feedback on overall team performance.
Monitors and provides feedback on individual team member performance.
PLANNING AND TASK COORDINATION

Helps coordinate and synchronize information and activities.
Helps establish task and role assignments for individual team members and ensure proper balancing of workload.
Employs a systematic, structured approach to task accomplishment.
Defines individual and shared responsibilities.
Effectively rotates group tasks among group members.

MEETING MANAGEMENT SKILLS

Supports the use of an agenda.
Volunteers for duty or role.
When timekeeper, keeps the meetings to allotted time.
When scribe, promptly distributes meeting notes to team members.
Defines and/or clarifies roles within the team.
Polls for consensus.
Summarizes discussions.
Proposes agenda items.
Asks for individual opinions and ideas.
Validates persons or statements.
Keeps group members on task (agenda).
Calls attention to team operating procedures or norms.
Appreciates feedback.
Does not explain, justify, defend or discount feedback, just says thank you.
Asks for specifics if not given.
Accepts feedback as one person’s perception of his or her behavior.

Notes

1. The instrument should eventually be placed on the Web if possible for several reasons. There is less paper to pass out and collect. Students and employees have the advantage of completing the surveys when most convenient for them. There are fewer data entry errors, and using software packages such as Microsoft Excel (Microsoft Office Suite, 1985) and Microsoft Access (Microsoft Office Suite, 1985) to organize, manipulate, and format data can save the administrator valuable time. Most of the processes can be automated, and once the system is fully functional, it requires very little maintenance and time (Nielsen & Halfhill, 2001).

2. If a team consists of five members, each person has four peer ratings. This implies two aggregation steps, and is easily accomplished using SPSS (1989). The SPSS syntax for this step is included in Appendix A. Simply compute means for each scale in the peer ratings data set, and then aggregate based on a unique identifier (e.g., last name or SSN). The result is an average score for each competency, for each team member, as rated by team members. Although this process could be accomplished using MS Excel (1985), it is much more tedious and error prone.

3. The aggregation procedure is similar to that outlined for the aggregation of peer ratings, and the SPSS syntax provided in Appendix A can be modified to automate these two aggregation steps as well. The result of this procedure is an average group performance rating and an average group viability rating for each team in the database.
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