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Statement of the Research Project

J.P. Morgan Services, Inc. implemented teams into its Private Client Group-Operations (PCG-Ops) located in Wilmington, Delaware during the summer of 1996, in an initiative the company called Realignment. The goal of my senior project is to explore the use of teams in corporate settings. By assessing how consistent the Private Client Group’s Realignment initiative is with the current team development, organizational change, and organizational development literature. In this project four main concepts will be examined:

1. The reasons why JP Morgan changed from a traditional hierarchical structure to one that is team based.

2. The results of the six month analysis of the development of the Realignment teams that I presented to PCG-Ops’s management.

3. Recommendations on how the PCG-Ops teams can improve their team variables: goals, roles, participation, meeting effectiveness, conflict management, recognition, feedback, group cohesiveness, energy, intergroup conflict and intragroup conflict.

4. How teams relate to leadership.

This project has two limitations. The first is location. Obviously, because of the significant distance between Virginia and Delaware, all of the raw datum on which this project is based was gathered from my internship with J.P. Morgan's PCG-Ops this summer and from the work I did for the company over Christmas break. My direct contact with the company and its employees was limited to two visits, and any other communication was made via telephone or e-mail. I hope that, meticulous documentation, a good memory, and close relationships with knowledgeable Private Banking employees will cause physical distance not to hinder or limit this project in any way.
The second limitation is that the work that I did on the Realignment teams is a baseline. Because there are no subsequent records of the teams' development, the my analysis of teams' development is not correlational, but purely descriptive.

The History of the Project

This project began when I worked for J.P. Morgan's PCG-Ops this summer to fulfill my Jepson internship requirement. As a team-based training analyst, I assisted in implementing the Realignment initiative. My work was exciting and rewarding, and the main reason I felt that way is that everything that I saw or did related to leadership. Early on, I knew that I wanted to incorporate the work that I was doing for PCG-Ops into my senior project, but until the end of the summer I was unclear of how I would accomplish this.

The idea of my senior project evolved during the internship evaluation meeting that I had with Mr. Donald Pierce, one of the vice presidents of PCG-Ops. In that meeting, Mr. Pierce told me he was thinking of documenting the history of the PCG-Ops's Realignment initiative so other people in Morgan would not have to recreate the wheel. He also mentioned that the development of the newly created Realignment teams needed to be measured. I had become very attached to PCG-Ops and the Realignment project, and I told Don that I would like to help the company in any way that I could. I explained that one way I could do this was with my senior project. At that point, I explained the requirements of the Jepson Senior project, and from there the two of us created an action plan that would benefit both the company and me. The following is the product of our decision.
Understanding Teams in Corporate Settings

The critical focus of this project is very specific. How consistent is the Private Client Group’s Realignment initiative with the current team development, organizational change, and organizational development literature? Before I address such a specific question, the more general concept of using teams to increase work effectiveness must first be understood. In an effort to increase the understanding of teams in corporate settings, the subsequent pages answer four critical questions surrounding teams:

1. What is a team?
2. Where and when did the team concept originate?
3. Why did corporations begin to incorporate the team concept?
4. What benefits do teams offer corporations?

What is a team?

A team is a group of interdependent people who are working towards a common goal. An Olympic track team exemplifies this definition well. In order for the Olympic track team to achieve its goal of winning the gold medal, individual team members must combine their unique talents and work together as a single unit. One person can not win the relay, but if the team wins, all of the team members win. Calvin Schmid, the J.P. Morgan consultant that I worked with this summer, used this example in his team training lessons, and it was very effective in conveying the way teams should work in the corporate world. Although this example depicts teams in a sport setting, it is important to realize that modern society is a complex of interdependent teams. People are called on to work with each other in a variety of situations, at work, home, schools, clubs, church, and community and service organizations. Just like a
football or basketball team, these organizational teams can malfunction and fail to score or win, and for many of the same reasons (Dyer 6).

**Where and when did the team concept originate?**

The emergence of the team idea can be traced back to the 1920's and 30's in the group dynamic area of social psychology. The classic Hawthorne Studies conducted by a group of Harvard University professors at the Hawthorne, Illinois plant of the Western Electric Company marked a breakthrough in organizational theory and practice because it identified some of the elements essential for team effectiveness. Elton Mayo, one of the original researchers in the Hawthorne Studies discussed the elements of team effectiveness in *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. These conditions for developing an effective work team, identified in a research effort begun in 1928, are still important considerations for managers nearly sixty years later (Dyer 9).

The concept of teams in organizations was born with the Hawthorne Studies, but it was not until twenty years later that, Douglas McGregor and Rensis Likert, two of the early writers in the area of management, began to emphasize the team concept as an important part of organization and management theory. McGregor discussed the managerial team in the last chapter of *The Human Side of Enterprise*, and identified the characteristics of an effective work team in other writings. At the same time that McGregor's book was having its impact, Likert, in *New Patterns of Management*, was developing his notion of organizations as a series of interlocking groups and the manager as a "linking pin" (Dyer 11). As he studied the research literature, Likert felt that managers must learn to cope with the totality of people under their direction and not just manage individuals one-to-one. Likert called his ideal form of
management "Participative Group" management. He identified twenty-four properties and performance characteristics of the ideal, highly effective group (Deyer 11). Another important duo of management writers was Blake and Mouton. They pointed out that a good team has task specialization and division of labor. An example of this is that a track relay team divides its effort between the four runners, but all efforts are combined into a single coordinated result. During the late 1950's and early 1960's, McGregor, Likert, Blake, and Mouton, dominated management theory. All of these writers began to emphasize the apparent advantages of participative management over more traditional authoritarian approaches (Deyer 20).

While some individuals did realize the merit in implementing the team concept into organizations, American industry did not provide the most conducive soil for this concept to grow and bloom. By the turn of the century, Frederick Taylor, the father of modern industrial engineering, had sold American industries on standardization and the centralized power of the hierarchical management structure. Taylor recommended that the best way to manage manufacturing organizations was to standardize the activity of general workers into simple, repetitive tasks and then closely supervise them (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson 6). The assembly line idea gave power to management, enabling management to do all of the thinking while the workers did all the doing. Industry accepted Taylor's management structure because at that time the work force composed of poorly educated immigrants, which was conducive to Taylor's management structure (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson 6).

Other countries in the world were more eager to experiment with teams and test their effects in the work place. In the early 1950's, Eric Trist discovered that when British coal miners were put in teams based on the sociotechnical nature of their job, productivity and job
satisfaction were higher than those workers who were not given as much control in their jobs. Trist's studies also indicated that organizations with workers who were more involved in the operation were better equipped to respond to changing market and political conditions—something that large and rigid organizations found difficult (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson 8).

The Volvo Corporation also discovered that teams can bring positive results to the work place. Volvo's Kalmar, Sweden plant was the first to reject the standard assembly line concept of manufacturing. A team approach was implemented instead, making groups of people responsible for whole sections of cars. This revolutionary idea raised employee morale and brought a 25 percent reduction in production costs (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson 8). Such fantastic results inspired Volvo to take the participative team concept one step further. They built plants where teams were responsible for assembling whole cars!

It was not until the early 1960's, with the Quality of Worklife movement, that America took a small step towards the team concept. Emphasis was placed on greater employee involvement. Managers and supervisors began asking employees for ideas that would make their jobs easier and more pleasant (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson 8). This concept was a temporary solution for improving employee satisfaction, but it was America's first step towards integrating teams into the work place.

In the 1970's, the Japanese idea of employee involvement groups called quality circles took hold in America. The goal of quality circles was to improve quality and cut costs. Quality circles brought groups of employees from different areas of the organization together to work together to solve specific quality, productivity, and service problems. Although quality circles served as temporary solutions and the quality circle members did not have the
power, or authority, to transform their ideas into reality, value was placed on workers' opinions, and recognition was given for work-related input and decisions—with some impressive results (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson 8). By the 1970's, American industries had bought in to the idea of participative management, but it would take another decade for the idea of self-directed work teams to be accepted. A few pioneer companies such as Procter & Gamble and the famous Gaines dog food plant in Topeka, Kansas took a risk and were the first to implement self-directed work teams into corporations.

**Why did corporations begin to incorporate the team concept?**

A few courageous companies initiated the team concept in their businesses before it became a necessity, but thousands of other companies implemented teams as a means of surviving the increased competitive pressure created by the rapid changes of the business world. As the twenty-first century approached, the world became increasingly dynamic, interdependent, and unpredictable. Companies realized that they needed new methods to adapt to all of the changes that the twenty-first century would bring. The impending future forced corporations were forced to recognize and respond to the globalization of the economy, the exponential growth of technology, as well as diversity, environmental issues, social awareness, and ethical responsibility all of which were becoming organizational priorities. These changes coupled with a shifting population, a change in values and a change in the traditional work ethic demand new organizational structures and a new definition of leadership (Blanchard, Carew, Parisi-Carew 7).

Teams were corporate America's answer to the call for a new organizational structure, and leaders who could be designers, teachers, and stewards replaced the charismatic decision
makers of the traditional hierarchical structure. In 1990, the average lifetime of the largest industrial enterprises was probably less than half the average lifetime of a person in an industrial society (Senge 280). The small number of companies that have survived for seventy-five years or longer say that the key to their survival was the ability to run experiments in the margin, and to continually explore new business and organizational opportunities that create potential new sources of growth (Senge 280). Adaptation and experimentation was the first steps to corporate survival. Companies had to realize that the corporate environment of the twenty-first century would be characterized by a flatter structure with increased individual responsibility and task-based work teams. The driver behind this focus was the necessity for increased speed and better customer service. Fortune magazine emphasized the importance of corporate adaptativeness when they said that the most successful corporation of the 1990’s will be something called a learning organization, a consummately adaptive enterprise (Senge 280).

Adaptation is only the first step that companies must make in order to survive the twenty-first century. Corporations do not want to merely adapt, because adapting means learning how to cope with change. Corporations also want to foster generative learning, that is thinking creatively. The total quality movement, a management strategy which grew out of the Japanese quality circles, formed a bridge between adaptive and generative learning with its emphasis on continuous experimentation and feedback, the total quality movement has been the first wave in building learning organizations (Senge 280).

**What benefits do teams offer corporations?**

Companies cite numerous reasons for implementing teams: improved quality, productivity, and service; greater flexibility; reduced operating costs; faster response to
technological change; fewer, simpler job classifications; increased morale; better response to new worker values. All of these aspects of work either directly, or indirectly, increases the amount of revenue a company generates. In plain English, teams positively effect a company's bottom line.

Hoerr and Pollock (1986) state that Business Week reports that plants designed with sociotechnical methods and using self-directed work teams are, on average, 30 to 50 percent more productive than their conventional counterparts (Wellins, Byham, Wilson 13-14). Here are some companies' that have been reported in recent literature with positive results attributed to teams:

- AT&T's Richmond, Virginia, operator service increased service quality by 12 percent (Wesner and Egan, 1990).
- Corning's new specialty cellular ceramics plant decreased defect rates from 1,800 parts per million to 9 parts per million (Sheridan, 1990)
- General Mills' plant that use teams are as much as 40 percent more productive than their plants operating without teams (Durmaine, 1990).

(Wellins, Byham, Wilson 14-15) More and more organizations like those aforementioned are proving that teams do cut costs and improve quality, productivity, and customer satisfaction. Positive results such as these are inspiring many organizations to experiments with the team concept.

A Brief History of J.P. Morgan

J.P. Morgan & Co. was founded in New York City in 1860, by John Pierpont Morgan. During the next 50 years, the J.P. Morgan led all others in financing the railroads, mines and steel mills which forged the United States into a great industrial nation (Morgan and You 1-3). J.P. Morgan has experienced much expansion since its inception and is now both a commercial and investment bank. It is a leading underwriter and trader of securities in the international
capital markets, one of the largest institutional investment advisors, and a major international bank. Its market is clearly defined serving major corporations, institutions, governments and financially sophisticated individual clients who demand the best service and the best performances (Morgan and You 1-2).

**J.P. Morgan in Delaware**

J.P. Morgan & Co. Incorporated formed J.P. Morgan Delaware in 1981. J.P. Morgan Services, Inc., a technology and operations services affiliate, was established in Delaware in 1985. The Private Client Group-Operations (PCG-Ops), which is the focus of this project, is a division of J.P. Morgan Services, Inc. and is located in the city of Wilmington.

**The Evolution of Teams in the DE Private Client Operations Group**

The concept of teams evolved in PCG-Ops over a four year time span. The first PCG-Ops team that was implemented was the self-directed work team of the Credit group. In December of 1993, a PCG-Ops employee by the name of Tim Troutman, learned about the concept of teams in an MBA course he was taking at Penn State University. He proposed to the PCG-Ops management that the Credit Group pilot self-directed work teams, and the management obliged him. At the same time, Client Services was implementing changes that also started people thinking that operations would have to come up with alternative ways to meet front office needs. These two initiatives, as well as other special projects, such as the Account Services project, that sought to increase department efficiencies by matching skill sets with the right functions, all reinforced the idea that teams should definitely be considered as a means of achieving many of the current business goals. From 1993 to 1995, the concept of teams was planted in the minds of the PCG-Ops management, but it lay relatively dormant. It
was not until the management of J.P. Morgan Private Banking in New York announced their Realignment plan that the team concept began to grow.

**Realignment**

In 1992, J.P. Morgan corporate headquarters wanted Private Banking to grow their business. After much assessment, Private Banking determined that one means of achieving corporate's goal was to redefine how Private Banking clients are serviced. J.P. Morgan's Private Banking division shifted its focus from that of a traditional banking organization with a product-centered approach to a client-centered approach where products and delivery mechanisms are designed to attract and satisfy clients (Client Service's Strategic Platform). This massive initiative that aimed to improve client service while reducing cost was called 'Realignment.'

As the operational support arm of J.P. Morgan Private Banking, corporate headquarters' goal of growing the Private Banking business would force PCG-Ops to significantly raise head-count in the future. In September of 1995, Jennifer Cavazzini, the Vice President of the Delaware Private Client Group-Operations, suggested implementing teams for PCG-Ops as a possible answer to the business constraints that Private Banking's Realignment would place on them.

The idea was researched by employees within the company and eventually PCG-Ops management decided to implement a Realignment project of their own. The PCG-Ops found that many of the issues that persuaded the front office to move to a client centered focus were also true in PCG-Ops: Clients prefer a single point of contact and service can be provided more efficiently when like functions are grouped together (Realignment Press Release). The
PCG-Ops management believed that teams would increase capacity, improve the quality of service, and provide the opportunity for people to develop broader skill sets, thus preparing them for the exponential growth that Private Banking expected.

The Private Client Group-Operations changed from a traditional hierarchical structure to one that is team oriented for the same reasons that other businesses cite for changing teams. Teams bring a competitive advantage to corporations. Corporate's mandate to grow the Private Banking business provided PCG-Ops an opportunity where they could either act or react to change. Corporate headquarters did not require PCG-Ops to implement their own Realignment, but PCG-Ops realized the benefits of teams and took advantage of an opportunity to be proactive.

**Realignment brought changes to PCG-Ops**

Realignment for PCG-Ops meant three large changes: redesign, teams-both cross functional, and working, and cross-training. After evaluating the organizational structure PCG-Ops management decided that it was important for like functions to be grouped together. A year-long project identifying and classifying all of the functions of PCG-Ops jobs revealed three broadly defined functions in the company: account information, account support, and reporting. These three groups provide the framework for the new organizational structure. Employees who have like function jobs work in cross functional and working teams within each group. Each PCG group has a team of managers. Each manager has primary accountability for a specific team, although each also has ultimate responsibility over all the teams within the group.
All of this "realigning" meant that everyone was working in at least one team. Teams had a team leader, team meetings, and team members cross-trained each other on how to do their functions. Since like functions were now grouped together, employees who had functions that changed teams or groups were required to move with their function. For this reason, some employees had new managers and co-workers. The following pages show PCG-Ops's organizational structure pre and post Realignment.

Was the Private Client Group Ready for Realignment?

Moving from a traditional hierarchical organizational structure to one that is team based is a major shift in the way people think of work. Wellins, Byham, and Wilson in their book, Empowered Teams, suggest that such a radical change warrants specific criteria and implementations to ensure successful teams. The following pages explore the criteria Wellins, Byham, and Wilson suggest for successful teams and describe how PCG fulfilled most of those requirements.

Teams must be tied to a strategic business objective and fit within the context of the organization's value system

One of the reasons teams fail in corporations is that sometimes the team concept is not compatible with the larger organizational culture and the organizations' overall business objectives. "A recent article in Industry Week (Verespej, 1990) warned: 'All too often corporate chieftains read the success stories and ordain their companies to adopt work teams-NOW. Work teams do not always work and may even be the wrong solution to the situation in question'" (Wellins, Byham, Wilson 82).
The idea of teams is tied to a strategic business objective in PCG-Ops. Implementing teams in Private Banking satisfied both primary and secondary business objectives. The need to grow the Private Banking business was a primary objective of the corporate office, but another of Jennifer Cavazzini's primary business objectives as the Vice President of the Private Client Group-Operations was not to increase head-count. Implementing teams was an alternative that satisfied both business objectives. Two secondary business objectives were also met with the implementation of teams. First, using teams fit the suggestions of the McKinsey Group. This consulting firm had indicated that flattening the corporate structure and increasing employee's accountability would greatly increase efficiency. Second, employee satisfaction was low at the time. Teams would allow employees more opportunity for advancement and personal growth, two areas of employee satisfaction that were repeatedly mentioned as needing improvement by workers in employee satisfaction surveys. Management believed that moving to teams would increase employee morale and job satisfaction.

Diversity is an issue that the company has publicly addressed since 1992. Because of Jennifer Cavazzini's dedication to the issue, diversity has become a part of the PCG-Ops culture. The team approach advocates diversity. Teams recognize people's differences and support the idea that everyone can add value in their own way. One of the reasons why teams can get work done more efficiently than individuals is that when people with different qualities and areas of expertise are brought together to accomplish a goal, the different perspectives allow the team to find synergies that an individual may not have recognized on their own.
Employees in an organization must be ready for teams

When implementing change in an organization it is helpful to have the support of a majority of the employees. Wellins, Byham, Wilson suggest that a "team readiness" assessment be conducted to determine an organization's cultural receptivity to teams.

Although the PCG did not conduct a formal "team readiness" assessment, comparisons were made between the Credit Group, groups at the Morgan Christian Center (MCC), and other groups within Morgan which had changed to a team structure, before the decision to implement teams in Private Client Group- Operations was made.

An employee satisfaction survey was also conducted which could be considered a way of assessing team readiness. The results of this study showed low employee satisfaction. Workers indicated that they wanted more opportunity for advancement, personal growth, and better salaries and benefit and compensation packages. The results of the employee satisfaction survey, thus, inadvertently showed that PCG-Ops employees might be ready for teams because what the employees desired were aspects that a team structure had the potential to improve. The comparison of employee populations and the employee satisfaction survey were two indicators that PCG-Ops used to determine that their employees were ready for teams.

A sociotechnical analysis should be conducted prior to team design

The sociotechnical analysis is a combination of social and technical variables which encourages teams to be designed in ways that optimize social, technical, and administrative systems (Wellins, Byham, Wilson 109). Three key steps are involved in the sociotechnical analysis: technical analysis, social analysis, and agreement on process and results measures.
Technical analysis

An *environmental scan* is one of the variables involved in a technical analysis. It shows who the organization's customers/clients are and what these people expect of the organization.

*Identifying the major unit operations* is another tool that can be used in a technical analysis. After the major units of operations are identified the process of the work is more clear and it is easier to identify value added activities and key work flow variances. The insight that both of these technical tools allows makes it easier for an organization's management to design teams that address both the strengths and weaknesses of an organization.

The PCG-Ops borrowed an environmental scan that Client Services did for their recent project. The results of this environmental scan made it very clear who dealt with PCG-Ops and what they expected. PCG-Ops's purpose as an operations unit was, and still is, to support Client Services and provide them with better service.

Before the teams were designated, a project to identify major unit operations was conducted. Every function within Private Banking was analyzed, and the skill sets for each of these functions were identified. Output units of each function were identified as well. Key variances, potential work flow disturbances, within these functions were noted, and the functions were reorganized to better match the skill sets of these groups and address these variances. As a point of interest, at the time of Realignment PCG-Ops placed more emphasis on who should do the job, rather than how they should do it. Most of the micro-level re-engineering aspects of the job functions were left for the employees to do themselves.
Social analysis

Social analysis primarily involves mapping employees' roles and responsibilities. Special consideration must be given to managers' tasks since the team concept is that over time some of the traditional managerial tasks will be transferred to team members. Mapping is done in order to create jobs with meaningful content (Wellins, Byham, Wilson 111).

The major unit operations project that was described in the technical analysis documented the formal roles and responsibilities of all of the employees, and later, in the Realignment process, the Training Project Team wanted to check the informal roles and responsibilities that employees had to assure that there were no loop holes. They asked all the managers to have their employees compose a "laundry list" of all the activities for which they were responsible in a normal day. Having a working knowledge of all of the tasks that the various people did, each team agreed which tasks would be designated to the team, team leader, and manager. This process was done during the second section of the "Team Start" training course, and further discussion about roles continued in team meetings.

Agreement on process and result measures

One of the final steps in the design process should be agreeing on the criteria and process that will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the design. These decisions should be made prior to the actual implementation and should be monitored immediately through observation, questionnaires, and other measurement tools showing hard bottom-line results (Wellins, Byham, Wilson 115). Establishing these standards at the onset demonstrates management's commitment to teams and is a way of keeping the team's attention focused on organizational goals.
PCG-Ops did establish some process and result measures before team implementation. A project plan was created for all the teams to establish deadlines for their cross-training and physical movement into teams. The Training project team also planned to use a comprehensive team survey, called the Task Oriented Team Development (TOTD), after six months to check the teams' development. This survey would be administered in one-on-one interviews and observations of the teams would also be conducted at that time. Both of these were process measures that were established before team implementation. As far as result measures, PCG-Ops had a very basic means of measuring performance. Teams were functioning correctly if they got the work done. They realized, of course, that the result measures should be based upon customer satisfaction, employee satisfaction, productivity, and number of errors, but tools to access these factors were not created before the implementation of teams and are still in the process of being developed. Because the work done in the teams in PCG is so varied, it does not lend itself to one comprehensive performance measurement tool. For an accurate appraisal of the teams' results, it is necessary that individual measurement tools be created for each function.

Methodology

"Why Teams? Assessing the Incorporation and Development of Teams at J.P. Morgan's Private Client Group-Operations," is an action-oriented project framed by theoretical concepts of organizational and change development. Specifically, it is empirical action research because recordings of the effect of certain actions are made and utilized as a basis for further action. Over time and with careful analysis of these experiences, generalized principles may be
developed (Marseilles and Rala, 65). My project is therefore, both quantitative and theoretical in nature.

The quantifiable aspect of this project is to assess the development of four of the teams that were implemented in the PCG-Ops with their Realignment initiative. I obtained data on the development of four of PCG-Ops's Realignment teams through one-on-one interviews which I conducted over Christmas vacation.

During the interviews employees completed the Task Oriented Team Development Survey (TOTD), a measurement tool that the internal consultant gave the team's managers at the conclusion of team training this summer. Although the TOTD was developed in the 1960's by Fry, the survey is extremely comprehensive and has been a standard assessment tool that J.P. Morgan has used for years. I added six questions to the end of the TOTD because I felt that a few areas needed to be addressed in greater detail. (See Appendix for TOTD Plus).

The TOTD Plus survey consists of 14 bipolar comparison scales. Each scale represents a different variable important in team development: goal clarity and conflict, role clarity, role conflict, participation/influence, meeting effectiveness/follow-up and conflict, conflict management, recognition/ involvement, feedback, support/cohesiveness, energy, enjoyment of the team, reasons for enjoying teams, intragroup conflict, intergroup conflict. Each scale consists of two statements that are polar opposites. Statement I denotes a dysfunctional team and statement II an optimal team. (Scales 6 and 12 deviate from this format). Team members choose from five response alternatives to explain where they feel their team is in development for this particular variable. Team members then must explain why they chose the particular answer. This last section of the TOTD Plus survey is valuable because it
forces subjects to justify their answers and provides descriptive data that gives meaning and color to numbers.

Mr. Pierce, my sponsor for the project and one of the vice presidents of PCG-Ops, chose the PCG-Ops teams that I assessed for team development. He wondered if there was a positive correlation between the length of time of team implementation and level of team development. The four teams he chose represented the range of team size, as well as, time lengths that teams had been implemented at PCG-Ops: the Calculation team 3 people 6 months, the Data Management team 10 people 3 months, the Reconciliation team 3 people 6 months, and the Credit team 15 people 2 years.

All of the full-time employees of each of the four teams were used for data. The sample size desired was, therefore, the total number of full time employees. It should be noted that two of the teams only had three members. The teams varied in characteristics depending on the team members and the team's overall job function. The particular characteristics of the teams will be discussed in more detail during the discussion section of the project.

The data from the TOTO Plus were analyzed in the following way. First, I calculated the team's frequency scores for the fourteen variables. For each scale I recorded the number of team members who chose answer a, b, c, d, or e. Second, I converted the answers' letter values to numerical values (a=1, b=2, c=3, d=4, e=5). Third, I calculated the mean (average) for each variable. Each variable could have a score from 1-5, with 1 being the least developed team, and 5 being the most developed team. Fourth, I calculated a team's total level of development by finding the mean of the above-mentioned averages in number 3, for the 14 variables. Lastly, I assessed PCG-Ops's total level of team development by determining the
grand mean of the four team's total development scores. All of the three management groups of PCG-Ops are represented in the four teams, thus the four teams seem to be representative of the population. The results of the samples, therefore should reflect where the PCG-Ops teams are in their development.

I was aware that an interview and survey methodology has natural limitations and took steps to minimize these limitations. The first limitation was the high level of variability when reading the TOTD Plus survey to the subjects in during the interview. The inflection and intonation that I used in speaking might favor certain answers, and there was no guarantee that I would read the TOTD Plus the same way in every interview. To reduce this variability I recorded myself reading the TOTD Plus survey and played the tape during all of the interviews. In creating the audio tape I also realized that everyone is not an audio learner. Therefore, I provided the subjects with a copy of the TOTD Plus survey so they could read along while they listened to the tape. The second limitation that I became aware of was that any methodology runs the risk of subjects lying or not telling the whole truth about issues. Hopefully, the initial request for honesty, guarantee of anonymity, careful observation of the subjects during the interview, and open ended questions helped improve the reliability of employee's answers. I was also careful to avoid leading questions in my interviews which might bias subjects to answer in a particular way.

The theoretical aspect of my senior project is framing the empirical action project with organizational change and organizational development theories and showing how all of it relates to leadership. My data from this portion of the paper are the most recent and prominent
literature in areas relevant to this project. I used both traditional and on-line research methods to obtain these data.

**Team Development Results**

This section presents in written form the results of the TOTD Plus, that are cited in the *Teams' Report Card* (see appendix). The following section interprets the teams' results offering insight and explanation. Starting with the big picture, the grand mean of team development for the Private Client Group-Operations was rated a 3.5, just above average, on a five point scale. Assessing the individual team scores, the Reconciliation team appears to be the relatively most developed with a 4.1. The Calculation and Data Management teams follow with closely ranging scores of 3.5 and 3.4, respectively. The Credit team generated a 2.9, the lowest level of team development out the four teams.

Each team varied in their level of team development, and had strong and weak areas. The **Calculation team** indicated that their team was most developed in the areas of participation & influence (4.3), role clarity (4.0), intragroup conflict (4.0), and support/cohesiveness (3.7). The Calculation team identified that they were least developed in the areas of intergroup conflict (2.3), role conflict (3.3), feedback (3.0), and energy (3.0). The scores of the **Data Management** team indicate that the team’s strengths are intragroup conflict (4.6), role clarity (4.0), and intergroup conflict (4.0). The TOTD Plus scores point to the team’s weaknesses as being conflict management (1.5), support/cohesiveness (2.8), feedback (2.9), participation/influence (3.0), and recognition/involvement (3.1). The **Reconciliation team** assessed themselves as most developed in the areas of intragroup conflict (5.0), role clarity (4.7), support & cohesiveness (4.7), and enjoyment of teams (4.7). They felt
that conflict management (3.0), inter-group conflict (3.3), energy (3.3), and feedback (3.3) were the areas that the team was the least developed. The Credit team's strong team areas were role clarity (3.6), role conflict (3.3), and inter-group conflict (3.7). Their weakest areas were meeting effectiveness/follow-up (2.1), feedback (2.3), support/cohesiveness (2.3), recognition/involvement (2.5), conflict management (2.5), participation/influence (2.6), and goal clarity & conflict (2.7).

The 14 team variables are arranged on the Teams' Report Card in descending order according to the four teams' total level of development for each variable. Notice that ability to handle intragroup conflict and role clarity are the teams' most developed variables, with scores of 4.5 and 4.1. The feedback and conflict management variables, were the least developed in all of the teams, with scores of 2.9 and 2.6.

On pages 1-14 of the Calculations, Data Management, Reconciliation, and Credit team's respective sections, the actual TOTD Plus assessment tool is shown, along with the frequency scores and employees' comments for each of the 14 team variables. These pages give meaning and insight to the averaged scores given above.

Discussion of Results and Ideas for Improvement

I was pleased with the results of the TOTD Plus, but not overly surprised. Having worked closely with the teams this summer, I realized that even though they felt like they were underdeveloped, in comparison to other documented team initiatives, they were on track. The grand mean of team development indicates that PCG-Ops teams are at 3.5 level of team development, and since the development was measured on a sliding scale from 1-5, 3.5 would be one whole point above average. This score is better than I expected, and, as Jennifer
Cavazzini expressed during my presentation, it represents a great accomplishment. All of the team members should be commended for their adaptation and management of change. While the grand mean suggests that the development of the PCG-Ops teams as a whole is above average, this number cannot be considered alone. The development scores of the four teams vary in their level of development reflecting the unique and specific challenges of each team.

Again, because of my internship this summer, I knew the background of the teams and was not surprised at the way the teams ranked in development: Reconciliation, Calculation, Data Management, and Credit. I was surprised, however, at the small difference (1.2) between the most developed team and the least developed team. During the interviewing process, it seemed as if the discrepancy between the teams would be larger and that some teams would rank lower than they are. This incorrect assumption demonstrates one of the many reasons why quantifiable data are important. Without some standard by which to measure results, everything is relative to the particular environment, and there is no objective means for comparing results in this way. In the following pages, I discuss the results of the Calculation, Data Management, Reconciliation, and Credit teams level of development in more detail. My interpretation of the data is based on information that I accrued from employee interviews and working at J.P. Morgan PCG-Ops this summer. For more employee feedback, refer to the appropriate team TOTD Plus results section at the end of the paper.

**Calculation and Reconciliation team**

The Calculation team is at a 3.5 level of development and the Reconciliation team is at a 4.1 level of development. According to the TOTD Plus assessment, these two teams have the most advanced development of the teams surveyed. Many factors, such as the team's
situational and member characteristics, help determine the team development. For instance, both the Calculation team and the Reconciliation team are members of the Reporting management group, and within that group, are members of the smaller cross-functional accounting team (refer to organizational chart). The team members of both the Calculation and Reporting team had the highest level of education out of the four teams. The team members are mature and conduct themselves in a professional manner which helps make the team run smoothly. Also, both teams consist of only three people. With such a small group, interaction is simplified and the potential for conflict is reduced. Probably the most important factor to consider is that both the Calculation and Reconciliation teams have changed the least with Realignment. Other than cross-training, very few functions have been added to the teams. This means that they have had less to adjust to than other PCG-Ops teams, and also since the work of both teams is very individualistic, therefore, their team interaction is minimal. As these factors imply the Calculation and Reconciliation teams have had to overcome fewer adversities than the other two groups. Their team development scores adequately reflect their particular situation.

In the following discussions, note that the Calculation and Reconciliation teams share three out of the four individual strengths and weaknesses. I again attribute similar team characteristics (i.e., size, members individual characteristics, and same manager) to the commonalities between the two teams.

**The Calculation Team's Strengths**

The Calculation team was most developed in the areas of participation & influence (4.3), role clarity (4.0), intragroup conflict (4.0), and support/cohesiveness (3.7).
Participation & influence

The degree in which team members participate in the group and considers themselves influential is critical in team development. A team where only some of the members participate and feel like their ideas are taken seriously lacks cohesiveness. Remember the saying- "A team is only as strong as its weakest link." In order to be effective, a team needs 100% involvement from every member.

I think that the size of the group and their mature attitude plays a large part in why the Calculation team's strongest team variable was participation and influence. The team's small size does not permit social loafing to occur. Instead, having three people on a team demands that all members participate. Team members told me during the interviews that they feel guilty if they don't participate in team meetings. They also expressed that everyone in their team is respected, as are their ideas. I worked closely with the Calculation team this summer, and noticed their mature and professional demeanor. I believe that these team characteristics are largely responsible for their accepting attitude. Not only is it natural for the members of the Calculation team to treat their co-workers this way, but also it is easy for them to understand that having everyone on the team participate can add significant value to their team by the unique perspectives and expertise each member brings.

Role clarity

Another important aspect in teams is role clarity. Are the requirements of the job clear? It is difficult for a team to achieve its goal when its members do not know what they should be doing.
It makes sense that role clarity should be one of the Calculation's most developed areas since the jobs are very individualistic and have not changed significantly since Realignment. Thus, the simple and stable environment does not allow for much role ambiguity to exist. Everyone on the Calculation team is clear on what their responsibilities are.

**Intragroup conflict**

This was one of the scales that I added to Fry's TOTD. Mr. Pierce wanted to assess how the teams handled conflict with teams within their work group—Account Information, Account Support, and Calculation. The ability to handle any type of conflict, whether it is between two different groups or within your own, is relevant to team development.

I attribute the Calculation team's high intragroup conflict score to its good working relationship with the other members of the Reporting group. Team members said that they rarely had problems interacting with other Reporting group members. This adheres to Coser's speculations (1956) concerning the solidifying effects of cohesion which have been confirmed empirically: "rises in intergroup conflict tend to go hand in hand with increases in intragroup cohesion" (Forsyth 401). The Calculation team experienced much intergroup conflict recently, as the TOTD Plus scores indicate in the next section.

**Support/cohesiveness**

The Calculation team's 3.7 level of development in support/cohesiveness I think can again be explained by the team's small size and the general nature of its members. Because there are only three people in the team even though their job functions are very individualistic in nature they are willing to help other team members.
The Calculation Team's Weaknesses

The Calculation team was least developed in the areas of intergroup conflict (2.3), role conflict (3.3), feedback (3.0), and energy (3.0).

Intergroup conflict

This team interacts regularly with the Data Management team and Morgan employees in New York. Employees interview comments consistently indicated that there has been some conflict with these two groups. The Calculation team feels that the Morgan employees in New York are not sensitive to their time constraints. Also, some team members feel that PCG-Ops employees lack a general understanding of some of their functions, which makes recognition of accomplishments difficult.

Ideas for improvement

I gave two suggestions for reducing intergroup conflict. First, reinstall the practice of new employees visiting the Morgan offices in New York. During the interviews, employees told me that in the past new employees were encouraged to visit the New York offices and meet with the people with whom they would be interacting on a regular basis. For some reason, this opportunity has not been utilized in the last few years, and now very few people are aware that this option even exists. Employees thought that re-implementing visits to New York would help improve inter-group relations. I agreed with the employees. Visiting New York could eliminate some of the communication problems between the two groups because it would be an opportunity not only for both parties to get to know each other on a personal level, but also to discuss potential work problems. The trip, also reinforces the big picture. By
going to New York, the employees can visibly see who they are supporting and how their work affects the whole Private Banking system.

My second recommendation was to re-engineer the Data Management functions that affect the Calculation team. From the employees explanations, the process seems repetitive and illogical. It may have looked better on paper to move these functions to the Data Management team, but in reality there would be less conflict between the groups and a more efficient process if the Calculation team were responsible for the functions.

Role conflict

The Calculation team's verbal explanations of their TOTD Plus answers revealed that cross-training caused some of them to feel role conflict. The responsibility of teaching team members about their work, in addition to their normal responsibilities overwhelmed some of the Calculation employees.

Ideas for improvement

I suggested that one of the ways the team could reduce role conflict was to set realistic training goals. Not meeting goals lowers morale and makes role conflict seem worse. Realistic goals increases the chance of achievement and affirms that role conflict can be avoided with sensible planning.

Feedback

In regard to the Calculation's average score for the feedback variable, the frequency distribution on p. 8 shows that each person in the Calculation team has a different opinion on the team's feedback ability.
Ideas for improvement

The team leader mentioned that she had been trying to improve the team's feedback skills. I told her that by her example she had already taken the first step in teaching her team members how to effectively communicate feedback and that she should continue to encourage the team to be more expressive with each other.

Energy

The last team variable that the Calculation team had low scores in was energy. I consider this category to be the teams enjoyment of their work. Although the team's energy score was a 3.0, which is average, it was low in comparison to the other team variables. As with any team, there are job aspects that frustrate them and make them feel like their energy is wasted.

Ideas for improvement

The interconflict was one of the frustrating job aspects aforementioned. The team felt interconflict could easily be improved, and reducing it would make their work easier and more enjoyable. I encouraged the team leader to discuss problems such as these during their team meetings and try and develop both short and long-term solutions.

The Reconciliation Team's Strengths

The Reconciliation team was most developed in the areas of intragroup conflict (5.0), role clarity (4.7), support & cohesiveness (4.7), and energy (3.3).

Intragroup conflict

All three of the Reconciliation team members agreed that their team had no problems with the other people in the Reporting group, which explains their perfect score of 5.0 for
intragroup conflict. Like the Calculations team, the Reconciliation team said that the Reporting members are aware of each others time constraints and delegate work accordingly.

Role clarity

Also like the Calculation team, the Reconciliation team rated role clarity high. Team members explained that the team knew what they had to do and were familiar with other members' roles from cross-training.

Support & cohesiveness

The Reconciliation and Calculation team also shared high levels of development in the area of support and cohesiveness. As I mentioned in the Calculation discussion, I think the team's small size and the general nature of its members makes it easier for the team to support each other and function as a cohesive unit.

Enjoyment of teams

The only variable that the Reconciliation and Calculation team differed on in the areas of team strength was enjoyment of teams. I believe that this distinguishes the two similar teams from each other. The enjoyment of the team concept pervades into all of the team variables, and I believe that the pro-team attitude partially accounts for the Reconciliation team's status as most developed team.

The Reconciliation Team's Weaknesses

The Reconciliation team was least developed in the areas of conflict management (3.0), intragroup conflict (3.3), energy (3.3) and feedback (3.3).
Conflict management

Conflict management was the variable that all of the teams struggled with the most. The frequency distribution chart on p. 6 shows that none of the team members agreed how their team would handle conflict in a hypothetical situation.

Ideas for improvement

Since the Reconciliation team never managed a conflict situation, I suggested to the team leader that they discuss appropriate conflict resolution approaches during a team meeting. Team members need to understand that consensus should be a team’s optimum response to conflict.

The Reconciliation teams intergroup conflict, energy, and feedback were also identified as weak areas in the team's development. These were three weak areas for the Calculation team as well, and many of the explanations given for the Calculation team's scores and my ideas for improving these areas overlap with the Reconciliation team.

Intragroup conflict

Like the Calculation team the Reconciliation team cited that there is tension between them and the New York administrators. The people in Delaware know what their team does and how crazy things get, but many of the people in New York have been told, but they do not listen.

Ideas for improvement

I suggested that the team reinstate trips to New York to improve the team's inter-group conflict. I gave the same suggestion for the Calculations team in regard to this variable and for the same reason.
Energy

The Reconciliation Group's energy variable was also rated low in level of development, notice in the frequency distribution chart on pg. 10 that two of the team members were at the high end of the scale while one of the members was at the low end. Scale number 10 is highly individualistic because it assesses an individual’s enjoyment of their job.

Ideas for improvements

When I asked during the interviews what improvements would make their job more enjoyable, the Reconciliation team members said increased headcount, research systems upgrade, and re-engineering functions with Data Management. I made these suggestions to management.

Feedback

While feedback is consistently a problem with the four teams, the Reconciliation team explained that the inadequate feedback lies not within the team, but the various levels outside of it. The Reconciliation team wants internal client feedback so they know how the clients think they are doing.

Ideas for improvement

Once again, I thought that the trip to New York city could improve feedback since the New York administrator have more direct interaction with the clients and thus could facilitate conversations about internal client feedback. The Reconciliation team would also like increased feedback from management.
Data Management Team

The Data Management team is the third most developed team with a 3.4 level of development. While the team's level of development was determined by averaging the scores for each of the fourteen team variables, I believe a team's situational factors give it a specific disposition which effects its development. The Data Management team is a part of the account information management group. It is one of the larger PCG-Ops teams, with 10 team members. The Data Management's large team size effected this team's development. One of the most noticeable results of the team's size was the existence of several clichés within this team. It will be discussed later how these clichés negatively affected critical team variables such as support/cohesiveness, participation/influence, recognition/involvement and to a certain extent the groups conflict management approach. The Data Management group also has the lowest degree of education of the four teams, which may account for some of the immature behavior of team members. Also, Realignment brought new team members, functions, and a new manager to the group. These are major changes that the team is still adapting to.

It seems clear that the Data Management team has different challenges to overcome than the Calculation and Reconciliation teams. While the Data Management team has the third lowest level of development, it is only .1 difference from the Calculation team's score. The discussions of the Data Management team's strengths and weaknesses may paint a dismal picture of the team's development, but while there is much room for improvement the results of the TOTD Plus indicate that the Data Management team is above average in its development.
The Data Management Team's Strength's

The Data Management team was most developed in the areas of intragroup conflict (4.6), role clarity (4.0), and intergroup conflict (4.0).

Intragroup conflict

The Data Management team scored high on the intragroup conflict scale, but it was apparent from the explanations during the interviews that there was more intergroup interaction than intragroup interaction. The intragroup interaction that was there was with the Payments team and the few people who were cross-training Data Management members. On a whole, the team did not have any problem working with other members of the Account Information management group.

Intergroup conflict

The intergroup conflict scale also received a high score, but the accuracy of the number is difficult to believe since both the Reconciliation and Calculation teams cited problems with Data Management. This question reveals the subjectivity of the TOTD Plus. All of the scores are based solely on the team members' personal assessments, and are therefore subject to members' discretion. While it is hard to assess why the Data Management scored themselves so high in intragroup conflict—whether the Data Management members are truly unaware of the tension between them and outside teams or they just wanted a high score, discrepancies in answers are apparent by cross-referencing the teams' answers and asking for explanations for each answer.
Role clarity

Data Management's high role clarity score seems to be legitimate. The functions of this team are very clear cut and team members know what their responsibilities are.

The Data Management Team's Weaknesses

The Data Management team was least developed in the areas of conflict management (1.5), support/cohesiveness (2.8), feedback (2.9), participation/influence (3.0), and recognition/involvement (3.1).

Conflict management

While conflict management was consistently every team's lowest area of development, the data management team has the lowest score. The frequency distribution reveals that while there was some variance in answers, most team members agreed that the team deals with conflict by denial. Many people expressed that they knew this conflict management approach was wrong, but couldn't do anything to change it.

Ideas for improvement

I suggested that decision-making training would be useful in this situation for several reasons. First, although many of the team members attended the decision-making lesson this summer, there are a several new people who have not been exposed to the material. Second, I think that the decision-making will be more meaningful to the team members now that they have been in their team for a few months and have experienced conflict. Third, the fact that many team members realize the team's conflict management approach is wrong is the first step. The second step is for these people to be educated on the other options and their benefits. In order for the decision-making training to be truly effective, I believe after the training, a team
discussion should be held where the team agrees to implement one of the more progressive conflict management approaches.

**Support/cohesiveness**

Support/cohesiveness, participation/influence, and recognition/involvement were also some of the Data Management teams lowest team variables. These three aspects of teams are interrelated and really compose the heart of the team. There are many factors, however, that inhibit the Data Management team from achieving a high level of development in these areas. The presence of clichés and pervasive self-interest are two of the many factors present in the Data Management team that inhibit the team from working together as one cohesive unit.

**Ideas for improvement**

Although team unity exercises might seem too "soft" for a corporate environment, I feel that before team members can support each other they have to be more comfortable interacting with each other. I suggested some basic ice-breakers and team unity exercises to facilitate and speed-up this process.

**Participation & influence**

In participation and influence, the team's frequency responses were a perfect bell curve. There are many people in the Data Management team who either do not participate in the team meetings or are not taken seriously. In the communication lesson this summer, Calvin emphasized the importance of including everyone in team discussions and taught how to communicate with people of various personality types.
Ideas for improvement

I think offering this communication program again would be beneficial to the team for many of the same reasons that I mentioned with the decision-making training.

Recognition/involvement

The Data Management team also had low a level of recognition/involvement which is very similar to team variable of participation/influence. I believe that some of the people are not involved in the team because they have tried in the past and they have been snubbed.

Ideas for improvement

In thought that implementing Dr. Couto's structured feedback program called "strokes & pokes" would be a good way build feedback skills and reinforce the idea that everyone adds value to the team in their unique way. I believe that even the small recognition of team members strokes and pokes could be enough reinforcement to draw some team members out of their shell and get them re-involved with the team.

Feedback

As one can imagine if a team's support/cohesiveness and recognition/involvement are low that the team feedback was mostly negative.

Ideas for improvement

Strokes and pokes, as well as, the I Speak communication lesson were my suggestion for improving feedback.
The Credit Team

The Credit team is the least developed of the four PCG-Ops teams with a developmental level of a 2.9. The Credit team is the least developmentally advanced of the four teams, but their situational context was also the least conducive to change. While it is natural to compare the teams, team scores need to be considered in their particular situational context, that is the history and characteristics that explains the current situation of the team and its members. Many changes have occurred since the concept of self-directed work teams was piloted on the group two years ago. The Credit team is a part of the Account Support management group. It has a total of 15 members which makes it the largest team surveyed. Like the Data Management team, the Credit team has identifiable clichés. In addition to the team's size, another factor that challenges group cohesiveness is that fact that the Credit team is composed of four smaller sub-groups, three of which were added to the team this summer from MCC. Also, the Credit team was without a manager for three months, and for two years has experienced a high turn-over rate. The Credit team members have an average degree of education in comparison to the other four teams. Team characteristics such as those mentioned above significantly influence how a team develops. The Credit team had the toughest situational context and their developmental score must be considered from that perspective.

The Credit Team's Strengths

The Credit team was most developed in the areas of intergroup conflict (3.7), role clarity (3.6), and role conflict (3.3).
Intergroup conflict

The Credit team had a high level of development in intergroup conflict. Many of the team members identified their out-group interaction as being with New York administrators and the Delaware financial team. They thought that they have a healthy cooperative relationship with these two parties, which the scores reflect.

Role Clarity

Role clarity was one of the team variables in which the Credit team scored the highest. This team did not have a problem with its members not knowing what their formal job responsibilities were, but I did notice that the team did have a problem with knowing what informal responsibilities each person had as a team member. Several Credit people told me that it is not clear who is responsible for the gray area- any left over work that needs to get done, but not by a specific person.

Role conflict

The Credit team's role conflict score indicates that role conflict was one of the team's strong areas, but looking at the frequency distribution on p. 3, the bi-modal distribution curve points to two groups of people with opposing ideas in this area. The Credit team's large size and four different sub-sections can explain these results. People within the various sub-sections of the team have different experiences because of the nature of the work and the people they interact with, therefore some of the responses in this area may vary.
The Credit Team's Weaknesses

The Credit team was least developed in the areas of meeting effectiveness/follow-up (2.1), feedback (2.3), support/cohesiveness (2.3), recognition/involvement (2.5), conflict management (2.5), participation/influence (2.6), and goal clarity & conflict (2.7).

Meeting effectiveness/follow-up

The Credit team's lowest score was in meeting effectiveness/follow-up. The team complained that the team meetings were ineffective because ideas are discussed, but never implemented. When a meeting does end with a resolution, the person who is supposed to carry it out does not follow through once they are back in the workplace. I attribute these problems to the three month absence of a manager, and lack of leadership within the team.

Ideas for improvement

My first suggestion is that the manager facilitate team meetings until the team members learn how to conduct an effective meeting. My second suggestion is that the team attend decision-making training, since half of the group was not a part of the team when the training was given and also because this lesson included how to reach resolutions and implement decisions. The root of the low scores in this, and other team variables, is that the team is in a state of disequilibrium because of the new people in the team and the lack of structure and guidance that resulted from the absence of a manager. I believe that the Credit team's manager must be highly directive with his team, until a stable environment is created.

Feedback

The Credit team had the most difficulty with feedback. The team members said that there is more negative feedback then positive in their team, and when they get feedback it is
from second hand gossip. Again, I feel that much of this problem stems from the team's situation.

Idea for improvement

My first suggestion for improving feedback is to re-teach the team the proper ways to give and receive feedback. This material was presented in the communication workshop this summer, but many of the people were not a part of the team at that time. My second suggestion is to reinforce the ideas of the communication workshop by incorporating the "pokes and strokes" feedback program in the work place. I believe that this program will teach people that feedback does not have to be threatening. Hopefully, the team will evolve from anonymously giving team members feedback on note cards to face to face feedback.

Support/cohesiveness

The Credit team also scored low on the support/cohesiveness variable. There are many reasons why this team is not very unified. First, I think that the large size of the teams, the different sub-groups, and the influx of new people makes cohesion and support difficult. Second, team members say that there is little challenge, change, development, or upward mobility in the Credit team. This situation makes people frustrated and encourages a competitive spirit. The team has not yet evolved to the "we" feeling that a cohesive team demands.

Idea for improvement

I suggested to the Credit team's manager that he use team unity exercises of a team project to accelerate the group forming process. I feel that many of the team members are still uncomfortable with each other and would benefit from activities that help them to get to know
each other. In regard to the issue of promotion, the PCG-Ops management suggested that managers encourage their employees to expand their skill sets so that they are more marketable and that team members inform their managers of their career aspirations so that the managers are more attentive to in-house opportunities.

Recognition/involvement and Participation/influence

In the Credit team, the recognition/involvement and participation/influence variables were both low in development and only varied by .1 in score. It makes sense that these two variables would have similar scores since they assess different nuances of a common topic. The team felt that some people were taken for granted in the group, and their contributions were not recognized. The team also felt that only certain people regularly participated in job discussions, and there are a few people on the team who are not taken seriously. As was mentioned in the discussion of the support/cohesiveness variable, the Credit team has not yet realized that everyone's contribution is needed in a team.

Idea for improvement

To improve the recognition/involvement aspect of the Credit team I suggested the "stokes and pokes" feedback program. This program would not only be beneficial for reinforcing good feedback techniques, but also the program would force people to recognize the different contributions that everyone in the team makes. In addition, the extra positive reinforcement might encourage people to become more involved in the team. To improve the participation/influence aspect of the team I suggested re-teaching the "I Speak" section of the communication lesson. This program emphasized the various communication styles and explained how people are more receptive to a message when it is coded in a way that is
appealing to their particular communication style. I think that this message is important in
increasing participation and influence because not only does it teach techniques that may get
people more involved, but also it emphasizes that every person's style is valuable to a team
because it adds another dimension.

Conflict management

Conflict management was an area that all of the teams had difficulty with, but where
some teams answered this scale based on hypothetical situations, the Credit team had a reserve
of examples from which to draw. Again, the team's situation lends itself to conflict, but the
team appears to be inconsistent in the manner in which it addresses conflict. Using the
frequency distribution on p. 8 as a guide, it seems that the Credit team some times ignores the
conflict, other times one person takes charge, still other times the two sides compromise, and
there have been occasions when people get very personal. I believe such irregularity is due in
part to the lack of supervision and structure that the team has had in the past. Even before the
three months absence of a manager, the existing manager was very "empowering" and gave the
team almost total decision-making ability. I think that such self-management was premature
for this team, and it lead to conflicts being resolved in whatever way the current influential
person thought best.

Ideas for improvement

One way to improve conflict management is to eliminated the cause of conflict. As I
have previously mentioned, management is taking steps to address the issue of promotions, and
also the stability of the work environment. There are two initiatives that I believe will improve
the management conflict in the Credit team. First I think that the current manager needs to
show the team the correct way to resolve conflict and to even have a team discussion about it. With time there would be less of a need for the manager's highly directive style, but for now I feel that the team needs the structure and guidance of a directive manager. Second, I think that the decision-making training class would benefit this team, not only because the curriculum cover conflict resolution and the new people in the team did not attend it, but also I think hearing this information again would be good for the other team members and it would be another opportunity for the team to interact with each other as a whole group.

Goal clarity & conflict

One of the team variables that the Credit team scored low in was goal clarity & conflict. The team expressed that the team as a whole knows what the main purpose of the day is, but every member does not follow through to meet the objectives. Some team members have problems prioritizing daily functions. Again, I think that the lack of focus for some team members relates to bad habits developed in an unstructured work environment and also frustration with the system.

There was no correlation between the length of time a teams were implemented and the level of team development. Teams had been instituted in Credit for two years, yet they had the lowest team development score. The Reconciliation team, on the other hand, had the highest level of team development and were only together as a team for six months. These results support the idea that while the length of time teams are implemented is one of the variables that determines team's level of development, there are many other variables that also must be taken into consideration.
The main variables that I focused on affecting team development in the PCG-Ops teams were team size, length of time that the teams were implemented, team leaders (managers), and even though I did not have quantitative evidence, team members' individual characteristics, such as level of education and maturity. There are numerous other situational variables that could have effected the teams' level of development that I did not explore- some of which are ethnic diversity, gender diversity, and physical office structure.

Most of the recommendations that I suggested in this paper, and to management, were actually employee suggestions. The recommendations, however, corresponded to what leadership experts and other companies that have implemented teams suggest for improving the different aspects of teams. It seems as if the employees and management at J.P. Morgan's Private Client Group-Operations have realized that leadership and team development are based on logical rational thought. Although PCG-Ops members did not cite a theory or a study to empirically support their suggestion, their recommendations were on target, and therefore, I did not hesitate to incorporated them with my own suggestions for improving team development in the PCG-Ops's teams.

**General Recommendations**

The Team Report Card showed that feedback and conflict management were two areas in which all of the PCG-Ops teams consistently had problems. This implies that in the future, PCG-Ops should address these areas in order to ensure the progress of their teams' development.
When I presented this data to the PCG-Ops management, Jennifer Cavazzini groaned when she saw that conflict management was one of the two lowest performance variables. She said that conflict management is a historical problem in PCG-Ops. If conflict management was an issue in PCG-Ops before the team concept was introduced, then it certainly will be an issue now, since the concept of teams advocates a more consensus style of decision making rather than management centered decision making of the traditional hierarchical management structures. I suggested that PCG-Ops offer decision making training for employees and management so that they can learn the groundwork for creative consensus decision making, as well as, other acceptable ways to manage conflict.

Feedback was the second lowest team performance variable. While I discussed means for improving job feedback earlier in the discussion section, I think that it is important to consider team feedback as well. I believe that much of the employee's anxiety about the Realignment process would be elevated if there was more concrete feedback concerning the effectiveness of the PCG-Ops teams. Thus far, the PCG-Ops team does not have any standard means of measuring team effectiveness. The PCG-Ops management realizes that team effectiveness should be based on whether they have achieved their goals of improved quality, productivity, customer satisfaction, and employee satisfaction, but it is difficult to create one comprehensive performance measurement tool since the work done in the PCG-Ops teams is so varied. The PCG-Ops management knows that it is necessary to create individual measurement tools that analyze
the performance of each team. They realize that they cannot continue to use "the work is getting done" as a criteria to measure team effectiveness.

**Be patience with team development**

My first and largest general recommendation for J.P. Morgan PCG-Ops is for employees and management alike to be patient with their new teams development. The TOTD Plus assessed that the PCG-Ops teams as a whole, were above average in their level of development. All of the teams, except one, scored above a 3.0 in their level of development. While these are remarkable scores for the amount of time that many of the teams have been implemented, teams progress at varying rates, depending on both internal and external influences (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson 217). Another point that needs to be considered is that team development is not necessarily a linear process. Wellins, Byham, and Wilson point also note that many teams and facilitators make the mistake of assuming that once a team achieves a certain level of functioning, it can only get better. Unfortunately, changes in team functioning do not always occur in a positive direction (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson 218). Teams can accelerate or regress with various situational circumstances. Wellins, Byham, and Wilson mention four common reasons for teams regressing in development: addition of new members, an emotional event that causes team trauma, management behavior that causes the team a crises of faith, and lack of attention or maintenance of team training and development. Many of these reasons explain the levels of development in the PCG-Ops teams, especially the Credit team, and were alluded to earlier in the discussion section.
**Team development is a continuous process**

My second recommendation is team development is a continuous process. Both individual and team progress needs to be monitored in order for a team to reach full development. Administering the TOTD Plus and tabulating the data, was PCG-Ops's first step in managing the continuous process of team development. Since the TOTD Plus was the first measurement of team development, the scores will serve as a benchmark for future assessments. It is suggested that similar measurement tools be administered on a quarterly basis to help the organization plan group training, development, and renewal activities (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson). I also think that in order to ensure that team development is indeed a continuous process, one person, or group, needs to be responsible for creating, monitoring, and facilitating a PCG-Ops team development plan.

**PCG-Ops leaders continue to support change**

My third recommendation is that the PCG-Ops leaders continue to support the changes and challenges that Realignment brings. Team building as a process will surely not have a long term impact if people who are in positions of power do not support team development procedures (Dyer 166). The PCG-Ops management has been very positive about Realignment with employees thus far. They introduced Realignment with a positive and precise change communication plan that followed the advice of communication experts and organizational change experts to the letter. Management's strong clear message supporting change appeared to reduce some of the anxiety the PCG-Ops employees were feeling this summer. When I returned to work at PCG-Ops over Christmas break, I noticed that the majority of the people had "bought in" to the team.
concept. There were less grumbling about training, and although it was not yet possible to see the quality, productivity, cost, or customer satisfaction results of implementing teams, the PCG-Ops employees, on several occasions, took advantage of the benefits that came with having a fellow team mate cross-trained in their function.

Although there are PCG-Ops managers who are not completely sold on the team concept, Jennifer Cavazzini, the Vice President of PCG-Ops, is totally dedicated to the Realignment initiative. She has explained to the managers that they are models for their employees, and therefore, their words and actions should present the team concept in a favorable light. My final suggestion to the PCG-Ops is that the leaders in PCG-Ops remember that teams do work, but changing to teams is, as with any type of change, a slow and arduous process. Organizational change experts say that it can take up to three years before the results of teams are apparent. The leaders of the PCG-Ops not only need to be aware of this and convey the message to their employees, but also they have to continue to support Realignment despite the setbacks and stumbling blocks that may lie in the future.

Teams and Leadership

Teams and leadership are related in many ways. First, the concept of teams is a management strategy, and leadership and management share the same history. Bass comments that the study of leaders and leadership is coterminous with the rise of civilization (Pierce and Newstrom 12), but management is also shaped by the current societal state. The popular theories of both leadership and management have evolved from being autocratic to democratic in nature. Leadership theories have spanned the
continuum from beginning with the trait oriented Great Man theories of leadership, as exemplified in Machiavelli's, The Prince, to highly participative leadership theories, such as Greenleaf's servant leadership where leaders, serve first and lead second. The history of management theory followed the same pattern with Frederick Taylor's top-down hierarchical structure where all of the decision making was done by management, to the virtually non-existent manager in self-directed work teams.

Although some leadership experts contend that leaders and managers are qualitatively different, and even mutually exclusive, I reject this theory. The essence of this argument is that "managers are oriented toward stability and leaders are oriented toward innovation; managers get people to do things more efficiently, whereas leaders get people to agree about what things should be done" (Yukl 4). I do not believe that in the rapidly changing world of the twenty-first century that such distinctions between leaders and managers will be possible. In order to survive in the increasingly competitive workplace, managers will have to be motivators and creative problem solvers.

The second way teams and leaders relate to each other is that teams promote leadership. The whole theory of participatory management seeks to flatten the hierarchical structure, gradually shifting the power and responsibility of the managers to the employees. In theory, teams provide a structure in which everyone can exert leadership.

There is a third way in which teams and leadership are related. The concept of teams is unique in it is both task and relationship oriented. Like other groups, teams focus on achieving goals, but unlike most groups, the process in which they achieve these goals is based on interaction and interdependence of the team members. Thus, teams promote
Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership model (1976). This theory asserts that situational demands for direction (task behavior) and socioemotional support (relationship behavior), as well as, the level of "maturity" of the follower or group are all important in determining appropriate leadership behavior (Pierce and Newstrom 89). With both the task and relationship aspects so deeply ingrained in the team concept, in theory, participative management should cultivate more versatile leaders who are equipped to handle task and relational situations with equal skill.

**Conclusion**

This paper spanned a wide variety of topics relating to teams in a corporate setting. From analyzing how J.P. Morgan's Private Client Group-Operations incorporated and developed teams, an understanding of the team concept from within a particular context is possible. The PCG-Ops appears consistent with other companies with similar team initiatives in their reasons for implementing teams and their teams' level of team development. While the presence of leadership theories and concepts within the team process are strongly felt, they are not generally recognized as such by the general public. I believe, however, that leadership studies will become more predominant in the corporate world as the demands of the twenty-first century destroy existing boundaries between the world of academia and corporate America.
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TOTD scale
Frequency scores
Team comments
Statement I:
I often wonder what the basic reason is for being here. It seems to me that there are people on the team (maybe even myself) who spend a lot of time and expend a lot of energy doing things that are not consistent with what I think is our main purpose. They downplay or overlook important parts of our total objective or they direct their efforts towards things I think aren’t very important.

Statement II:
The team’s basic overall objectives are very clear to me. All of my and everyone else’s effort seems directly related to getting these key goals accomplished. Whenever a question arises over what things need to get done, we are able to set priorities by referring back to our basic objectives.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Reconciliation team said...
- The objectives of our team are very clear. They have not changed with Realignment.
- One of our objective is to be thoroughly cross-trained. I haven’t had an opportunity to do this, but I am aware that it is a team objective.
Statement I:
Often situations arise on the job where I’m not certain what I’m supposed to do. Frequently I’m not even sure if a situation is my responsibility or someone else’s. We never get together to discuss what each individual thinks he or she and the others on the job can or should do to work together to do the best job.

Statement II:
In almost every situation I am very sure about what responsibilities I have and about what others on the job are supposed to be doing. These job responsibilities are often discussed by members of the team, particularly when someone has a question about what he or she or someone else should be doing.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Reconciliation team said...

- All of us on the team know what we have to do.
- I know what my team member’s roles are from the cross-training and other training that our team has done.
Statement I:
Different people on the job are always asking me to do different things at the same time. Often these tasks get in the way of each other or there just isn’t enough time to meet everyone’s demands. My job makes me feel like a juggler with too many balls in the air.

Statement II:
I have no trouble doing the different things that the job and other people on the team require of me. I understand why I’m supposed to do the things I do, and it all seems to fit together. If I feel as though the demands people on the team make of me are getting too heavy or don’t make sense, I resolve the problem by discussing it with them.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Reconciliation team said...
- Everyone always has questions for our team that they want answers to right away. This makes our roles hectic at times.
- I understand why I’m supposed to do the things I do, but I still have trouble seeing how everything fits together with Realignment.
Statement I:
When some people try to participate in a discussion of job issues, they often get cut off or their suggestions seems to die. People only pay attention to some team members and not to others. Some people do most of the talking while others don’t participate very much.

Statement II:
Everyone gets a chance to express himself or herself and to influence the group in discussions about the job. We listen to every person’s contributions and try to discuss the strong points of each. No one is ignored. Everyone is drawn into the discussions.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Reconciliation team said...

- No one in our team is scared of expressing himself or herself. Everyone listens to each other.
- Because our meetings are so informal and our team is so small, it is very hard not to participate in team discussions.
Statement I:
When we sit down to discuss something, I usually walk away wondering what we just did and what is supposed to happen next. It often seems as though we never really get anything done. If, as a result of a discussion, I am assigned to do something, I often do not agree with the tasks assigned me. It seems like the same problems keep coming up for discussion even though we thought we had worked them through already.

Statement II:
When we have a problem to discuss, I usually understand exactly what the issue is. By the end of the discussion, I usually understand what we have decided to do about it, and what my responsibilities are. Decisions made by this team are carried out effectively by the team members. We seem to get the task done whenever we meet.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Reconciliation team said...
- Our team meetings are very informal because nothing formal is needed.
- Our team meetings are usually effective from a short-term perspective, but we are ineffective at solving long-term problems. This is due in part to our reliance on NY for answers.
- We do not have enough follow up on NY issues. Everyone, both here and there, is so busy, which is not really a good enough excuse.
When a disagreement arises in the team:

**Selection:**

a) Don't get personal; let it blow over

b) One person takes charge

c) Compromise between the two positions

d) Find a position that the whole team can agree on

---

**Conflict management**

Number of responses

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**What the Reconciliation team said...**

- People on my team compromise to decide on vacation days.

- Although our team has never had a true conflict, I think that Cheryl would take charge and make a decision for the team. She would probably encourage us to discuss the issue, but her original decision would not change.
Statement I:
I often get the feeling that some people on the team don’t think that some other people on the team have much of a contribution to make. Some people don’t pay much attention to the problems or suggestions of others. People are often taken for granted.

Statement II:
Everyone recognizes that the job could not be done without the cooperation and contribution of everyone else. Each person, including myself, is treated as an important part of the team. When you bring up an idea or a problem, people sit up and take notice. It makes you feel that you and your job are important.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Reconciliation team said...
- Even though my job has nothing to do with my two other team members, they still value me. Everyone realizes each other’s importance.
- The team members say what a good job everyone does, but management, and even Cheryl, does not give us as much recognition as I feel individuals would like.
Statement I:
I never hear directly how I’m doing and how I’m perceived. Sometimes I’m surprised at how people react to what members say and do. I get the feeling that intentions are not understood and individual efforts are not appreciated, yet seldom do we take the time to explore these feelings and perceptions with each other in my team.

Statement II:
Team members take the time to provide feedback to each other in order to clarify how our behaviors affect how we work together. We use this information to improve our individual and team effectiveness and gain a clearer appreciation of each other’s contributions. In addition, communication is more open and relaxed within the team.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Reconciliation team said...

- Our team communicates with each other how we are doing, but feedback outside of the team is lacking.
- There is no internal client feedback. We have no idea how good of a job clients think we are doing. The only time we hear anything is when it is negative.
Statement I:
This job really get me down. People do not seem concerned with helping each other get the job done. Everyone is pulling in different directions; everyone is out for himself. If you try to do something different you get jumped on by people for being out of line. If you make a mistake, you never hear the end of it.

Statement II:
I really like my job, and I like working with this team. The team encourages you to take responsibility. You feel really appreciated by the other members of the team when you do a good job. When things aren’t going well, people really make an effort to help each other. We really pull together on this team.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Reconciliation team said...

- Everyone in our team gets along well together.
- My job doesn’t get me down. I love what I do!
- Realignment has given the team more opportunities to be supportive of each other because of the required cross-training.
Statement I:
I often feel as though a lot of my energy has been wasted. Many of the things I have to do seem like unnecessary expenditures of time and energy that could be done more efficiently. I often wish we could get it together better.

Statement II:
I usually have a feeling of accomplishment and satisfaction. Even when I am tired, I know my time and energy have been well spent. I am able to devote myself to getting the job done with a minimum of hassle. We all know our jobs and work together efficiently to get them done.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Reconciliation team said...

- I go home at the end of the day feeling satisfied.
- Data Management used to cause our team a lot of stress which made work less enjoyable, but things have been better recently.
- It will take a long time, but there is definitely room for improvement in the area of computer systems. Improvements to systems would address many issues that currently frustrate my teammates and me.
Statement I:
A non-team structure is the type of environment in which I like to work. I prefer a top-down hierarchical management structure where I work alone and report directly and only to my boss. If I have a problem, I take it to management to solve.

Statement II:
I enjoy working in a team. I like a flatter organizational structure where there is much interdependence between the team members. I enjoy the fact that we interact with each other on a daily basis and help each other solve problems.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

Enjoyment of teams

What the Reconciliation team said...

• I worked in teams at a previous job. I enjoy working in a team.

• I like teams because I would get bored if I sat by myself all day. I like getting suggestions from teammates.
The aspects of teams that most appeal to me are:

Selection:
- improved efficiency
- improved productivity
- interaction with others
- having a support system
- belonging to a group
- being a part of an innovative Mgt. strategy
- more open communication
- more decision-making responsibilities
- task variety
- job ownership
- better idea of the big picture of the business

Reconciliation team
Statement I:
Often I feel like there is a lot of tension between my team and the other teams within my work group (Reporting). Some of my teammates are resentful of other team members within my work group because they do not understand our workload or time constraints. Many of us have acquired new functions or have been cross-trained often have questions that go unanswered. Other work group teams are unwilling to help because they are no longer responsible for those functions. There is a significant amount of discord in my work group (Reporting).

Statement II:
The teams that are within my work group (Reporting) function in perfect harmony. All teams within my work group have a good working relationship with each other. They understand the work load and time constraints that the other teams face. They are willing to help other teams on material they don’t understand or skills that need improvement. There is no strife between the teams in my work group.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Reconciliation team said...
- Everyone in Reporting works well together. We are familiar with each other’s time constraints.
- Reporting members are very open-minded and helpful.
Statement I:
Much of my daily work stress is caused by teams outside my work group (Acct. Info. and Acct. Support) who are responsible for functions that directly relate to my work. These other teams do not value my job. They do not understand why their work is a priority for me.

Statement II:
Although many of my daily functions are dependent on the work of teams outside my work group, our cooperative efforts minimizes hostile feelings. My team gets along well with the teams outside our work group. We try to understand how our work impacts the other teams, and they do the same with us. I think that everyone realizes that each team adds value to the company in their own way. My team does not have problems with the teams outside of my work group (Acct. Info. and Acct. Support).

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Reconciliation team said...
- Inter-group relations are not perfect. There is still plenty of room for improvement.
- People in DE know what our team does and how crazy things get. Many of the people in NY have been told, but they don’t listen.
Reconciliation Team's Self Assessment
(Average Scores)

- Inter-group conflict: 3.3
- Intra-group conflict: 5.0
- Enjoyment of teams: 4.7
- Energy: 3.3
- Support/cohesiveness: 4.7
- Feedback: 3.3
- Recognition/involvement: 4.7
- Conflict management: 3.0
- Meeting effectiveness/follow-up: 4.0
- Participation & influence: 4.3
- Role conflict: 4.3
- Role clarity: 4.7
- Goal clarity & conflict: 4.0

Level of Team Development (Max. = 5)
Team’s Averaged TODT Scores
Assessing Team Development In
The JP Morgan Private Client Group
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TOTD scale
Frequency scores
Team comments
Statement I:
I often wonder what the basic reason is for being here. It seems to me that there are people on the team (maybe even myself) who spend a lot of time and expend a lot of energy doing things that are not consistent with what I think is our main purpose. They downplay or overlook important parts of our total objective or they direct their efforts towards things I think aren’t very important.

Statement II:
The team’s basic overall objectives are very clear to me. All of my and everyone else’s effort seems directly related to getting these key goals accomplished. Whenever a question arises over what things need to get done, we are able to set priorities by referring back to our basic objectives.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

Goal clarity & conflict

What the Calculation team said...

- The team has no problems prioritizing most things. There are times though when I wonder where all our efforts are going.

- January and February are our busiest times. The team was able to devise a plan to get through this tough time by setting priorities and referring back to our basic objectives.
Statement I:
Often situations arise on the job where I’m not certain what I’m supposed to do. Frequently I’m not even sure if a situation is my responsibility or someone else’s. We never get together to discuss what each individual thinks he or she and the others on the job can or should do to work together to do the best job.

Statement II:
In almost every situation I am very sure about what responsibilities I have and about what others on the job are supposed to be doing. These job responsibilities are often discussed by members of the team, particularly when someone has a question about what he or she or someone else should be doing.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Calculation team said...

- Everyone knows what their responsibilities are, but whether they can get them all done is another story.
- I still think that people in our team are unsure about Realignment. Not knowing what their full job responsibilities might be in the future unnerves them.
Statement I:
Different people on the job are always asking me to do different things at the same time. Often these tasks get in the way of each other or there just isn’t enough time to meet everyone’s demands. My job makes me feel like a juggler with too many balls in the air.

Statement II:
I have no trouble doing the different things that the job and other people on the team require of me. I understand why I’m supposed to do the things I do, and it all seems to fit together. If I feel as though the demands people on the team make of me are getting too heavy or don’t make sense, I resolve the problem by discussing it with them.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Calculation team said...
- I understand why my role is crazy right now. I can go on because I know that it won’t be like this forever.
- With year end, new functions, and all the old functions, I definitely feel like a juggler with too many balls in the air.
- I feel like I am being pulled in four different directions. Hopefully, it will settle down after some of the training is completed, but right now some of my training goes on the back burner because of the daily nature of my job.
Statement I:
When some people try to participate in a discussion of job issues, they often get cut off or their suggestions seem to die. People only pay attention to some team members and not to others. Some people do most of the talking while others don’t participate very much.

Statement II:
Everyone gets a chance to express himself or herself and to influence the group in discussions about the job. We listen to every person’s contributions and try to discuss the strong points of each. No one is ignored. Everyone is drawn into the discussions.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Calculation team said...

- Both teams within the Accounting group work very well together. Of course, everyone’s ideas can’t be implemented, but everyone’s is given a chance to express their ideas.

- We really don’t have too many team discussions, but when we do, we would never ignore each other.
TOTD Scale 5: Meeting Effectiveness/Follow Up

Statement I:
When we sit down to discuss something, I usually walk away wondering what we just did and what is supposed to happen next. It often seems as though we never really get anything done. If, as a result of a discussion, I am assigned to do something, I often do not agree with the tasks assigned me. It seems like the same problems keep coming up for discussion even though we thought we had worked them through already.

Statement II:
When we have a problem to discuss, I usually understand exactly what the issue is. By the end of the discussion, I usually understand what we have decided to do about it, and what my responsibilities are. Decisions made by this team are carried out effectively by the team members. We seem to get the task done whenever we meet.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Calculation team said...
- Our meetings are very informal. We usually stand at someone’s desk and talk.
- Meetings are not always a 100% effective because there is still a lot of uncertainty about cross-training. People don’t understand why there is a need for it and when it will happen.
When a disagreement arises in the team:

Selection:

a) Don't get personal; let it blow over
b) One person takes charge
c) Compromise between the two positions
d) Find a position that the whole team can agree on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict management</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of team development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What the Calculation team said...

- Our team has never experienced a true conflict. Hypothetically speaking, the team members would compromise to solve the disagreement.

- Never has our team ever had any personal problems. . . . We do compromise when we discuss training issues.
Statement I:
I often get the feeling that some people on the team don’t think that some other people on the team have much of a contribution to make. Some people don’t pay much attention to the problems or suggestions of others. People are often taken for granted.

Statement II:
Everyone recognizes that the job could not be done without the cooperation and contribution of everyone else. Each person, including myself, is treated as an important part of the team. When you bring up an idea or a problem, people sit up and take notice. It makes you feel that you and your job are important.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Calculation team said...

- Everyone contributes a lot to the group. Everyone on the team has their own individual strengths which the team recognizes.

- The bottom line is that no one in Delaware really knows what I do. Therefore, they can’t recognize my efforts. I am not eligible for any of the DE reward programs and New York doesn’t have one implemented.
Statement I:
I never hear directly how I’m doing and how I’m perceived. Sometimes I’m surprised at how people react to what members say and do. I get the feeling that intentions are not understood and individual efforts are not appreciated, yet seldom do we take the time to explore these feelings and perceptions with each other in my team.

Statement II:
Team members take the time to provide feedback to each other in order to clarify how our behaviors affect how we work together. We use this information to improve our individual and team effectiveness and gain a clearer appreciation of each other’s contributions. In addition, communication is more open and relaxed within the team.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Calculation team said...

- Krista, our team leader, is a strong advocate of feedback.

- It’s difficult for the team to give me honest feedback on my training. I am pushing the issue though, and working with them to be more communicative with me.

- When I am training people I try to reinforce good behavior with small praises.
Statement I: This job really gets me down. People do not seem concerned with helping each other get the job done. Everyone is pulling in different directions; everyone is out for himself. If you try to do something different you get jumped on by people for being out of line. If you make a mistake, you never hear the end of it.

Statement II: I really like my job, and I like working with this team. The team encourages you to take responsibility. You feel really appreciated by the other members of the team when you do a good job. When things aren't going well, people really make an effort to help each other.

We really pull together on this team.

Selection: a) Just like I  b) More like I than II  c) In between I and II  d) More like II than I  e) Just like II

What the Calculation team said:
- I think that our team can work together more in encouraging each other. It will be an easy area to improve.
- If you make a mistake in our team, you have to re-prove yourself to the members.
- If a mistake is made, people are more concerned with who did it, rather than why it happened or how it can be prevented in the future.
Statement I:
I often feel as though a lot of my energy has been wasted. Many of the things I have to do seem like unnecessary expenditures of time and energy that could be done more efficiently. I often wish we could get it together better.

Statement II:
I usually have a feeling of accomplishment and satisfaction. Even when I am tired, I know my time and energy have been well spent. I am able to devote myself to getting the job done with a minimum of hassle. We all know our jobs and work together efficiently to get them done.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Calculation team said...
- I don’t feel like my energy is wasted. Many of the processes behind my job functions have been fine tuned. Also, I have been doing my job long enough that I know the most efficient methods to get the work done.
- If other groups paid more attention to the details of their jobs, then a significant amount of my energy would be saved.
- Where I lack in knowledge, I make up in organization. I am always trying to think of more efficient ways of doing things.
Statement I:
A non-team structure is the type of environment in which I like to work. I prefer a top-down hierarchical management structure where I work alone and report directly and only to my boss. If I have a problem, I take it to management to solve.

Statement II:
I enjoy working in a team. I like a flatter organizational structure where there is much interdependence between the team members. I enjoy the fact that we interact with each other on a daily basis and help each other solve problems.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

Enjoyment of teams
Number of responses

Level of team development

What the Calculation team said...

- I enjoy working in a team because it is fun, and I enjoy the interdependence.
- I don't like a top-down hierarchical management structure, but I am not in total agreement that the team concept is right for our group because of the nature of our work.
Read the statement and then rank order the options to reflect your preference, with 1 being first and 11 being last.

The aspects of teams that most appeal to me are:

Selection:
- improved efficiency
- improved productivity
- interaction with others
- having a support system
- belonging to a group
- being a part of an innovative mgt. strategy
- more open communication
- more decision-making responsibilities
- task variety
- job ownership
- better idea of the big picture of the business

Number of responses: 2

Reasons for enjoyment of teams
- Business goals
- Personal growth
- Need for inclusion
- Other

Level of team development

What the Calculation team said...

Calculation team
**Statement I:**
Often I feel like there is a lot of tension between my team and the other teams within my work group (Reporting). Some of my teammates are resentful of other team members within my work group because they do not understand our workload or time constraints. Many of us have acquired new functions or have been cross-trained often have questions that go unanswered. Other work group teams are unwilling to help because they are no longer responsible for those functions. There is a significant amount of discord in my work group (Reporting).

**Statement II:**
The teams that are within my work group (Reporting) function in perfect harmony. All teams within my work group have a good working relationship with each other. They understand the work load and time constraints that the other teams face. They are willing to help other teams on material they don’t understand or skills that need improvement. There is no strife between the teams in my work group.

**Selection:**
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

**What the Calculation team said...**
- There is some tension with the other people in the Reporting group, but they are like that with other people too.
- I have no problems with the people I interact with in the Reporting group.
Statement I:
Much of my daily work stress is caused by teams outside my work group (Acct. Info. and Acct. Support) who are responsible for functions that directly relate to my work. These other teams do not value my job. They do not understand why their work is a priority for me.

Statement II:
Although many of my daily functions are dependent on the work of teams outside my work group, our cooperative efforts minimizes hostile feelings. My team gets along well with the teams outside our work group. We try to understand how our work impacts the other teams, and they do the same with us. I think that everyone realizes that each team adds value to the company in their own way. My team does not have problems with the teams outside of my work group (Acct. Info. and Acct. Support).

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Calculation team said...
- Data Management doesn’t enter time deposits well. In the past few months their error rate has gone up which causes me considerable stress.
- Data Management does not understand why our work is a priority. The same is true with New York. They don’t realize that work needs to be done by 1 P.M.
Team's Averaged TODT Scores
Calculation Team's Self Assessment
(Average Scores)

- Inter-group conflict: 2.3
- Intra-group conflict: 4.0
- Enjoyment of teams: 3.3
- Energy: 3.0
- Support/cohesiveness: 3.7
- Feedback: 3.0
- Recognition/involvement: 4.0
- Conflict management: 3.3
- Meeting effectiveness/follow-up: 3.7
- Participation & influence: 4.3
- Role conflict: 3.3
- Role clarity: 4.0
- Goal clarity & conflict: 3.7

Level of Team Development (Max = 5)
Assessing Team Development In
The JP Morgan Private Client
Group

- Credit Team -

Christine M. Wang
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TOTD scale
Frequency scores
Team comments
Statement I:
I often wonder what the basic reason is for being here. It seems to me that there are people on the team (maybe even myself) who spend a lot of time and expend a lot of energy doing things that are not consistent with what I think is our main purpose. They downplay or overlook important parts of our total objective or they direct their efforts towards things I think aren’t very important.

Statement II:
The team’s basic overall objectives are very clear to me. All of my and everyone else’s effort seems directly related to getting these key goals accomplished. Whenever a question arises over what things need to get done, we are able to set priorities by referring back to our basic objectives.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Credit team said...
- I think that the team knows what the main purpose of the day is, but every member doesn’t follow through to meet the objectives. Work gets done by the end of the day, but that’s because other team members pick up the slack.
- The daily goal is last on many people’s agendas. Instead these people focus on little projects. They have problem prioritizing.
- There are people on the team who down-play or overlook important objectives.
- People have problems prioritizing daily functions. Everyone is not on the same page.
Statement I:
Often situations arise on the job where I’m not certain what I’m supposed to do. Frequently I’m not even sure if a situation is my responsibility or someone else’s. We never get together to discuss what each individual thinks he or she and the others on the job can or should do to work together to do the best job.

Statement II:
In almost every situation I am very sure about what responsibilities I have and about what others on the job are supposed to be doing. These job responsibilities are often discussed by members of the team, particularly when someone has a question about what he or she or someone else should be doing.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Credit team said...
- There is a lot of uncertainty in the team structure- specifically where the boundaries of responsibility are. There is a gray area as to who should pick up the slack if team members don’t fulfill their designated responsibilities.
- In my own job, I know what my responsibilities are and what I am supposed to do to accomplish those responsibilities. I know what other team members’ responsibilities are, but not necessarily what they do all day.
- The role clarity of my job depends on the day. Sometimes there are projects that I don’t know about.
- There are people on the team who have a problem with role clarity. Some don’t know what their roles in Credit are, and others know what their roles are but choose not to do them.
Statement I:
Different people on the job are always asking me to do different things at the same time. Often these tasks get in the way of each other or there just isn’t enough time to meet everyone’s demands. My job makes me feel like a juggler with too many balls in the air.

Statement II:
I have no trouble doing the different things that the job and other people on the team require of me. I understand why I’m supposed to do the things I do, and it all seems to fit together. If I feel as though the demands people on the team make of me are getting too heavy or don’t make sense, I resolve the problem by discussing it with them.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Credit team said...

- When our Libor team came from MCC, we were told that we would learn Prime and the Prime people would learn Libor. That has not been the case. Prime was not given the same message. I started to cross-train on Prime, but I had to stop because no one was helping me on Libor and my daily work suffered.
- Workload is our team’s number one problem right now. Larry is helping us to resolve this problem.
- Role conflict is more likely to happen at the end of the month and when it’s your turn to proof.
- As a senior member, I get most of the client problems. As a team leader I have team members coming to me with problems. Sometimes I feel like I can’t devote the time to the team because of outside pressure. I have learned to prioritize daily work with team leader responsibilities.
Statement I:
When we sit down to discuss something, I usually walk away wondering what we just did and what is supposed to happen next. It often seems as though we never really get anything done. If, as a result of a discussion, I am assigned to do something, I often do not agree with the tasks assigned me. It seems like the same problems keep coming up for discussion even though we thought we had worked them through already.

Statement II:
When we have a problem to discuss, I usually understand exactly what the issue is. By the end of the discussion, I usually understand what we have decided to do about it, and what my responsibilities are. Decisions made by this team are carried out effectively by the team members. We seem to get the task done whenever we meet.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

---

**What the Credit team said...**

- Topics are brought up in team meetings for as many as three times, or until people buy into them. Then nothing happens. Hopefully, with time and Larry's help, we will become more like statement II.
- Most of the time people vent their feelings in the meetings, but there is no closure. I think that much of this problem stemmed from not having a manager to direct us.
- When a meeting does end with a resolution, the person who is supposed to carry it out doesn't follow through once they are back in the work place. Implementation is the problem.
Statement I:
When some people try to participate in a discussion of job issues, they often get cut off or their suggestions seem to die. People only pay attention to some team members and not to others. Some people do most of the talking while others don’t participate very much.

Statement II:
Everyone gets a chance to express himself or herself and to influence the group in discussions about the job. We listen to every person’s contributions and try to discuss the strong points of each. No one is ignored. Everyone is drawn into the discussions.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Credit team said...
- There are some team members who always participate and speak their mind. There are also quiet ones who never say anything in the meetings, but gossip about the issues back in the workplace.
- When the Libor group came here, the Prime group wouldn’t listen to Libor issues. After awhile the Libor group began to do the same thing. I guess we had a “if you can’t beat them, then join them” rational.
- I think that our team “hear” all of the team members, but they don’t really “listen” to everyone’s ideas.
- One or two people in the team are not taken seriously.
- Larry has started a new practices in the team meetings. We now ask if there is anyone who has an issue that was not on the agenda that they want to discuss.
When a disagreement arises in the team:

Selection:
a) Don’t get personal; let it blow over
b) One person takes charge
c) Compromise between the two positions
d) Find a position that the whole team can agree on

What the Credit team said...

- I want to make a choice e). When a disagreement arises in the team, we get really petty and personal, and stab each other in the back.

- Our team can’t take constructive criticism. We can’t communicate without the intervention of a manager.

- The way in which conflicts are resolved depends on the people involved. If the conflict is between people with strong personalities there will be hard feelings and gossip.

- It is very obvious when some team members are not happy. They won’t say anything, but you can read the emotions on their faces.

- We are trying to compromise with the current workload distribution issue.

- In the past our team has dealt with conflict by the two people who talk the loudest and longest yelling at each other and then leaving the room. Larry is our mediator now.
Statement I:
I often get the feeling that some people on the team don’t think that some other people on the team have much of a contribution to make. Some people don't pay much attention to the problems or suggestions of others. People are often taken for granted.

Statement II:
Everyone recognizes that the job could not be done without the cooperation and contribution of everyone else. Each person, including myself, is treated as an important part of the team. When you bring up an idea or a problem, people sit up and take notice. It makes you feel that you and your job are important.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

**What the Credit team said...**
- There are certain people who are always taken for granted in our group.
- A lot of people are taken for granted in our team. Management and the team don’t realize people’s potentials. Some people are recognized more freely for no rhyme or reason.
- People do realize that they have to work together if they want to get home on time.
- The people who are taking on the extra responsibilities of the team are the complainers of the group.
- People don’t help each other out. They play games on their computer or do their homework.
- There is not enough employee recognition from management. A one year review does not suffice.
Statement I:
I never hear directly how I’m doing and how I’m perceived. Sometimes I’m surprised at how people react to what members say and do. I get the feeling that intentions are not understood and individual efforts are not appreciated, yet seldom do we take the time to explore these feelings and perceptions with each other in my team.

Statement II:
Team members take the time to provide feedback to each other in order to clarify how our behaviors affect how we work together. We use this information to improve our individual and team effectiveness and gain a clearer appreciation of each other’s contributions. In addition, communication is more open and relaxed within the team.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Credit team said...
- There is more negative feedback then positive feedback in the team. We never hear anything until something goes wrong, and then people hear the negative feedback third or fourth hand.
- We have had problems with communication in the past, but now the Libor people give each other good feedback. As a whole team though, we do not communicate well together.
- The team has feedback sessions, but they aren’t productive because team members feel threatened by feedback. The feedback session turns into a verbal slapping match rather than a time for constructive communication.
- People rarely take the time to say, “You did that well.” I try and fill the “cheerleader” role on our team because I realize we need it.
Statement I:
This job really gets me down. People do not seem concerned with helping each other get the job done. Everyone is pulling in different directions; everyone is out for himself. If you try to do something different you get jumped on by people for being out of line. If you make a mistake, you never hear the end of it.

Statement II:
I really like my job, and I like working with this team. The team encourages you to take responsibility. You feel really appreciated by the other members of the team when you do a good job. When things aren’t going well, people really make an effort to help each other. We really pull together on this team.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Credit team said...
- Everyone is out for themselves. There is no challenge, change, development, or upward mobility in the Credit team. There is no motivation for people to stay in this team. People only want to move up and out.
- Certain people want to be in the spotlight. They try to bring others down so they can get the spotlight. People are quick to point out team members’ faults and do not hesitate to bring them to the attention of management.
- Diversity and teams don’t work well together. There are too many conflicts.
- To make a mistake in this team is crucifixion!
Statement I:
I often feel as though a lot of my energy has been wasted. Many of the things I have to do seem like unnecessary expenditures of time and energy that could be done more efficiently. I often wish we could get it together better.

Statement II:
I usually have a feeling of accomplishment and satisfaction. Even when I am tired, I know my time and energy have been well spent. I am able to devote myself to getting the job done with a minimum of hassle. We all know our jobs and work together efficiently to get them done.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Credit team said...
- In my job I feel like a lot of my energy is wasted because I physically walk over to the Payments team to wait for money. We need one person inputting and another person releasing.
- I am satisfied by the work I do in my Libor group, but I get frustrated by the team as a whole because it’s like Romper Room.
- Now that many of the unnecessary things have been cut out of the processes, I think that we just need practice working together.
- The work flow issue makes me feel more like statement I than statement II, but our team is addressing this issue.
- I feel like there is an unnecessary expenditure of time because the computer system that I use is a loan system, not mortgage, and that forces me to do much of my work manually.
Statement I:
A non-team structure is the type of environment in which I like to work. I prefer a top-down hierarchical management structure where I work alone and report directly and only to my boss. If I have a problem, I take it to management to solve.

Statement II:
I enjoy working in a team. I like a flatter organizational structure where there is much interdependence between the team members. I enjoy the fact that we interact with each other on a daily basis and help each other solve problems.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Credit team said...

- I know that a team structure is better for Morgan. My concern is how they are going to promote people with such a flat structure.
- Even though I didn’t have any prior experience with teams, I enjoy a team structure because I don’t have anyone looking over my shoulder.
- I am a natural team player, and I like the idea of teams. With the experiences that I have had with the team concept in Credit, however, I would choose the traditional hierarchical structure. Credit is not working as a team. People in Credit think that “team” means just getting the work done at the end of the day. That’s not a team, and certainly not a self-directed one.
- I really think that the concept of teams is a Marxist idea. Maybe teams work in other contexts, but it doesn’t work for Credit.
- NY doesn’t support the team concept. The NY administrators only deal with a few Credit people that they like and work well with. This causes the work to be poorly distributed and the team concept to be weakened.
Read the statement and then rank order the options to reflect your preference, with 1 being first and 11 being last.

The aspects of teams that most appeal to me are:

Selection:
- improved efficiency
- improved productivity
- interaction with others
- having a support system
- belonging to a group
- being a part of an innovative mgt. strategy
- more open communication
- more decision-making responsibilities
- task variety
- job ownership
- better idea of the big picture of the business

What the Credit team said...
Statement I:
Often I feel like there is a lot of tension between my team and the other teams within my work group (Acct. Support). Some of my teammates are resentful of other team members within my work group because they do not understand our workload or time constraints. Many of us have acquired new functions or have been cross-train and often have questions that go unanswered. Other work group teams are unwilling to help because they are no longer responsible for those functions. There is a significant amount of discord in my work group (Acct. Support).

Statement II:
The teams that are within my work group (Acct. Support) function in perfect harmony. All teams within my work group have a good working relationship with each other. They understand the work load and time constraints that the other teams face. They are willing to help other teams on material they don’t understand or skills that need improvement. There is no strife between the teams in my work group.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

Intra-group conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of team development</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What the Credit team said...
- In the past, the Payments team has not been friendly or helpful in doing transactions for Credit. Although as of June we started doing most of our own transactions, there is still resentment from the Payments team.
- I think that there is some tension between the Loan group and the other groups that make up the Credit team because Mortgage and Letter of Credit have not learned their responsibilities yet. The team is anxious for them to be cross-trained.
TOTD Scale 14: Inter-Group Conflict

Statement I:
Much of my daily work stress is caused by teams outside my work group (Acct. Info. and Reporting) who are responsible for functions that directly relate to my work. These other teams do not value my job. They do not understand why their work is a priority for me.

Statement II:
Although many of my daily functions are dependent on the work of teams outside my work group, our cooperative efforts minimizes hostile feelings. My team gets along well with the teams outside our work group. We try to understand how our work impacts the other teams, and they do the same with us. I think that everyone realizes that each team adds value to the company in their own way. My team does not have problems with the teams outside of my work group (Acct. Info. and Reporting).

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

Inter-group conflict

Number of responses

Level of team development

What the Credit team said...
- I mainly deal with NY administrators and the DE financial team. If you stand up to them and let them know what’s going on, you won’t have problems. I think that our team often suffers from a small man’s complex. Sometimes people get bitter that they are little DE and have to support big NY.
- There are times when we clash with the administrators in NY and MCC, but on a whole I think that we support them well.
- Any problems we have with NY administrators result from Prime and Libor groups which do things different ways with the same client.
Team's Averaged TODT Scores
Credit Team's Self Assessment
(Average Scores)

Inter-group conflict: 3.7
Intra-group conflict: 4.3
Enjoyment of teams: 3.1
Energy: 2.9
Support/cohesiveness: 2.3
Feedback: 2.3
Recognition/involvement: 2.5
Conflict management: 2.5
Meeting effectiveness/follow-up: 2.1
Participation & influence: 2.6
Role conflict: 3.3
Role clarity: 3.6
Goal clarity & conflict: 2.7

Level of Team Development (Max. = 5)
Assessing Team Development In
The JP Morgan Private Client Group

- Data Management Team -

Christine M. Wang
The University of Richmond
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Statement I:
I often wonder what the basic reason is for being here. It seems to me that there are people on the team (maybe even myself) who spend a lot of time and expend a lot of energy doing things that are not consistent with what I think is our main purpose. They downplay or overlook important parts of our total objective or they direct their efforts towards things I think aren’t very important.

Statement II:
The team’s basic overall objectives are very clear to me. All of my and everyone else’s effort seems directly related to getting these key goals accomplished. Whenever a question arises over what things need to get done, we are able to set priorities by referring back to our basic objectives.

Selection:
   a) Just like I
   b) More like I than II
   c) In between I and II
   d) More like II than I
   e) Just like II

What the Data Management team said...
- Everyone on the team has daily goals... The objectives are clear since the work is deadline driven.
- The business goals are clear. Every day we set priorities.
- Goals would be more clear if the work environment was better organized.
- The team knows what is priority, but they don’t do it. They want someone to remind them.
- The people who have been on the team for awhile know what their objectives are, but the people who are recently new are still learning.
Statement I:
Often situations arise on the job where I’m not certain what I’m supposed to do. Frequently I’m not even sure if a situation is my responsibility or someone else’s. We never get together to discuss what each individual thinks he or she and the others on the job can or should do to work together to do the best job.

Statement II:
In almost every situation I am very sure about what responsibilities I have and about what others on the job are supposed to be doing. These job responsibilities are often discussed by members of the team, particularly when someone has a question about what he or she or someone else should be doing.

Selection:
   a) Just like I
   b) More like I than II
   c) In between I and II
   d) More like II than I
   e) Just like II

What the Data Management team said...
- Everyone knows their responsibilities. If they have questions, they can always ask.
- Team meetings help clarify responsibilities within the group.
- Most people know the functions of the other team members
TOTD Scale 3: Role Conflict

Statement I:
Different people on the job are always asking me to do different things at the same time. Often these tasks get in the way of each other or there just isn’t enough time to meet everyone’s demands. My job makes me feel like a juggler with too many balls in the air.

Statement II:
I have no trouble doing the different things that the job and other people on the team require of me. I understand why I’m supposed to do the things I do, and it all seems to fit together. If I feel as though the demands people on the team make of me are getting too heavy or don’t make sense, I resolve the problem by discussing it with them.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Data Management team said...
- There are times when I feel overwhelmed. It is hard with Realignment. Our team took on so many new functions and didn’t give any away....With cross-training and low head count, many people on the team are working overtime.
- I prioritize my work and ask team members for help if I feel overwhelmed.
- Many people ask me to do extra things, but I have learned to say “no” if my plate is too full with my own responsibilities.
- When I go to do the non-daily function that I was cross-trained in and I have questions about the task, the trainer doesn’t have time to help me. I am still expected to get the task done and done right- with or without someone’s help.
**Statement I:**
When some people try to participate in a discussion of job issues, they often get cut off or their suggestions seem to die. People only pay attention to some team members and not to others. Some people do most of the talking while others don't participate very much.

**Statement II:**
Everyone gets a chance to express himself or herself and to influence the group in discussions about the job. We listen to every person’s contributions and try to discuss the strong points of each. No one is ignored. Everyone is drawn into the discussions.

**Selection:**
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

**What the Data Management team said...**
- Everyone has an opportunity to express their opinion. The team listens to everyone, but some people are not taken as seriously as others.
- Often when people have suggestions they are given a “This is how we’ve always done it.” response.
- There are definitely a few people on the team that have more influence than others.
- The new management has helped pull everyone together. Chris makes you talk in the team meetings.
- In the team meetings there are some people who always bring up topics for discussion, but others never say anything. It is the people who are quiet in the meetings who complain out on the floor.
When a disagreement arises in the team:

Selection:

a) Don't get personal; let it blow over

b) One person takes charge

c) Compromise between the two positions

d) Find a position that the whole team can agree on

What the Data Management team said...

- Each individual reacts to conflict in a different way. The team usually tries to compromise between the two disagreeing parties, but some individuals in the team handle conflict by not talking with each other.

- Team members usually give good explanations with their ideas. Usually, people are willing to meet the other party half way.

- I feel like I should say certain things when conflict arises, but I don't. I know that it is wrong, but I always think that things will work themselves out on their own. I don't want to get personal because it might affect the daily work.

- I don't experience conflict in my smaller group within the team. I think that the problems lie between the new groups brought in with Realignment.

- In the past disagreements were solved by Dawn, the Team Leader. She made decisions for the group.
Statement I:
I often get the feeling that some people on the team don't think that some other people on the team have much of a contribution to make. Some people don't pay much attention to the problems or suggestions of others. People are often taken for granted.

Statement II:
Everyone recognizes that the job could not be done without the cooperation and contribution of everyone else. Each person, including myself, is treated as an important part of the team. When you bring up an idea or a problem, people sit up and take notice. It makes you feel that you and your job are important.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Data Management team said...

- People in the team have a “me versus them” attitude. Everyone thinks that they do more work than the rest of the team.
- There are individuals in the team that are not taken seriously because they make little problems into big problems.
- Dawn and Chris are open to everyone’s suggestions and are willing to implement them. I think that the team considers its members only at face value. They don’t look to see how people can contribute to the big picture.
Statement I:
I never hear directly how I’m doing and how I’m perceived. Sometimes I’m surprised at how people react to what members say and do. I get the feeling that intentions are not understood and individual efforts are not appreciated, yet seldom do we take the time to explore these feelings and perceptions with each other in my team.

Statement II:
Team members take the time to provide feedback to each other in order to clarify how our behaviors affect how we work together. We use this information to improve our individual and team effectiveness and gain a clearer appreciation of each other’s contributions. In addition, communication is more open and relaxed within the team.

Selection:
- a) Just like I
- b) More like I than II
- c) In between I and II
- d) More like II than I
- e) Just like II

What the Data Management team said...
- Most feedback from peers is negative. The problem isn’t that people are receiving negative feedback, but it is the way in which feedback is given. People in this team do not know how to give or receive constructive criticism.
- Sometimes I correct other people’s mistakes myself without telling them. I know that it’s not necessarily good to do this, but often it’s easier.
- It’s strange, but during crunch time our team communicates better than we normally do.
- I am receiving good feedback from the individual who is training me.
Statement I:
This job really get me down. People do not seem concerned with helping each other get the job done. Everyone is pulling in different directions; everyone is out for himself. If you try to do something different you get jumped on by people for being out of line. If you make a mistake, you never hear the end of it.

Statement II:
I really like my job, and I like working with this team. The team encourages you to take responsibility. You feel really appreciated by the other members of the team when you do a good job. When things aren’t going well, people really make an effort to help each other. We really pull together on this team.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Data Management team said...
- I work closely with one individual. The two of us really do pull together and answer each others questions.
- I enjoy my job, but would enjoy it even more if the team pulled together and if everyone would be more open and responsive to others ideas.
- Our team is cliquish. The different cliches don’t talk with each other.
- I know what it means to be a member of a good team, and I definitely don’t feel that Data Management is one at this time. I am not even comfortable asking my team members for help.
- Not everyone is working together. The team is not concerned about helping each other. Some people on the team are really out for only themselves.
- The Data Management Christmas party was pathetic. Everyone got their food and ate at their desks. No one made an effort to socialize.
Statement I:
I often feel as though a lot of my energy has been wasted. Many of the things I have to do seem like unnecessary expenditures of time and energy that could be done more efficiently. I often wish we could get it together better.

Statement II:
I usually have a feeling of accomplishment and satisfaction. Even when I am tired, I know my time and energy have been well spent. I am able to devote myself to getting the job done with a minimum of hassle. We all know our jobs and work together efficiently to get them done.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Data Management team said...
- I feel rewarded about the individual work I do, but the work done as a total group is a waste of time.
- I do often wish our team could get it together better, but we need to be more organized.
- Sometimes I feel like my energy is wasted, but that is due Realignment and repeated functions.
- I think that the team will get better with time.
Statement I:
A non-team structure is the type of environment in which I like to work. I prefer a top-down hierarchical management structure where I work alone and report directly and only to my boss. If I have a problem, I take it to management to solve.

Statement II:
I enjoy working in a team. I like a flatter organizational structure where there is much interdependence between the team members. I enjoy the fact that we interact with each other on a daily basis and help each other solve problems.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Data Management team said...

- I prefer working by myself because it is easier to be more organized and it reduces the number of conflicts.
- I like working in a team because you can bounce ideas off of other team members.
- I had a great team experience in my past job.
- Theoretically teams are good. Having no one person with more authority than anyone else can cause problems though.
Read the statement and then rank order the options to reflect your preference, with 1 being first and 11 being last.

The aspects of teams that most appeal to me are:

Selection:
- improved efficiency
- improved productivity
- interaction with others
- having a support system
- belonging to a group
- being a part of an innovative mgt. strategy
- more open communication
- more decision-making responsibilities
- task variety
- job ownership
- better idea of the big picture of the business

Reasons for Enjoyment of Teams

What the Data Management team said...

Data Management team
Statement I:
Often I feel like there is a lot of tension between my team and the other teams within my work group (Acct. Info.). Some of my teammates are resentful of other team members within my work group because they do not understand our workload or time constraints. Many of us have acquired new functions or have been cross-train often have questions that go unanswered. Other work group teams are unwilling to help because they are no longer responsible for those functions. There is a significant amount of discord in my work group (Acct. Info.).

Statement II:
The teams that are within my work group (Acct. Info.) function in perfect harmony. All teams within my work group have a good working relationship with each other. They understand the work load and time constraints that the other teams face. They are willing to help other teams on material they don’t understand or skills that need improvement. There is no strife between the teams in my work group.

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Data Management team said...

- I have found that the people cross-training don’t want to answer questions after the formal training period ends.
- I have interaction with Payments because we assumed one of their functions. I haven’t had any problems with them.
Statement I:
Much of my daily work stress is caused by teams outside my work group (Acct. Support and Reporting) who are responsible for functions that directly relate to my work. These other teams do not value my job. They don not understand why their work is a priority for me.

Statement II:
Although many of my daily functions are dependent on the work of teams outside my work group, our cooperative efforts minimize hostile feelings. My team gets along well with the teams outside our work group. We try to understand how our work impacts the other teams, and they do the same with us. I think that everyone realizes that each team adds value to the company in their own way. My team does not have problems with the teams outside of my work group (Acct. Support and Reporting).

Selection:
a) Just like I
b) More like I than II
c) In between I and II
d) More like II than I
e) Just like II

What the Data Management team said...

- Sometimes Account Support realizes our team’s priorities and limitations. They need to remember that we only have two people inputting their work.
- I don’t think other teams realize how important DDA is.
- Sometimes, I think that the Reporting group believes that we don’t have any other daily functions. They always want their work to be first priority.
- I deal with account managers in New York, and I have never had problems or conflicts with them.
Data Management Team's Self Assessment
(Average Scores)

- Inter-group conflict: 4.0
- Intra-group conflict: 4.6
- Enjoyment of teams: 4.3
- Energy: 3.6
- Support/cohesiveness: 2.8
- Feedback: 2.9
- Recognition/involvement: 3.1
- Conflict management: 1.5
- Meeting effectiveness/follow-up: 3.6
- Participation & influence: 3.0
- Role conflict: 3.3
- Role clarity: 4.0
- Goal clarity & conflict: 3.0

Level of Team Development (Max = 5)
Team’s Averaged TODT Scores
Team Development Assessment (1 of 4)

Summary #1

Level of Team Development

Goal clarity & conflict

Role clarity

Role conflict

Calc

Datamgt

Recon

Credit

3.7 3.0 2.7 4.7 3.6 3.3 3.3 3.3
Team Development Assessment (2 of 4)

Summary #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Team Development</th>
<th>Participation &amp; influence</th>
<th>Meeting effectiveness &amp; follow-up</th>
<th>Conflict management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Calc
- Datamgt
- Recon
- Credit
Summary #3

Level of Team Development

Recognition/involvement
Feedback
Support/cohesiveness

Calc
Datamgt
Recon
Credit
Team Development Assessment (4 of 4)

Summary #4

Level of Team Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Enjoyment of teams</th>
<th>Intra-group conflict</th>
<th>Inter-group conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calc</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datamgt</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recon</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Teams' Report Card

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calc</th>
<th>Datamgt</th>
<th>Recon</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intra-group conflict</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role clarity</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of teams</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition/involvement</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation &amp; influence</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting effectiveness &amp; follow-up</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support/cohesiveness</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-group conflict</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal clarity &amp; conflict</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Delaware PB Support Structure

Account Information
26 + 4 non reg

Processing
11 (10.05)

Flowers (TL)
Hunter
Ranalli
Snedler
Alexander
Miles (TL)
Episcopo
Messick
TBA
G. Moore
Van Williams

Cash
2.0

Lewis
Shatley

*Remittances, MMA, (Payroll, Deposit/WD, other cash transactions), client bill pay, fee processing (APS) for Custody, I/M, Trust, PAAS, tax fees

*Exception Handling: sig verify, stop pymts, check suspects, cautions.

*Adjustments/inquiries, fraud, collections, G/L reconc., tax payments

Prod/Distr
2 Reg, 4 Non-reg
(5.4)

Mailing
5.0
Accendo (TL)
Drakes
Non-reg (Tony)
Non-reg (Judd)
Non-reg (Bill)

*Advices, confirms, bills, 1098’s, statements, checks, booklets, report distribution, 1099’s, special mailings.

Filing, Scanning
1.0 (85)

A/S, CIR, Credit
Non-reg

Primary Function Type
Quality-focused
Systems-oriented
Daily and periodic deadlines
Transactional

CROSS-FUNCTIONAL TEAM - Members possess working knowledge of all functions within group.

Working Team - Members have specific concentrations/expertise

General Responsibilities
- Static client information maintenance
- Systems interfaces
- Standard mailings
- Standard systems-supported transactions and calculations

Data Management

- CTF maint., headsheets, authorities DB, maintain Money Mgr./Broker info, Dataease
- *Omni, ACE, IMMS perf reps addresses, Book Value, Tax Cost, CTF muni factors
- *PBIS info, std party/PBN, DDA, Newtrend, PBIS APS

- Hollis
Collings
TBA
Ryan
Nichols
Thayer
Kaminski
Gould
D.H. Kreiss (TL)
Aiken
Agee.
New Delaware PB Support Structure

Account Support

**Credit Support**
- **Dawis**
  - Devlin
  - Hobey (TL)
  - Iwasyk
  - D. Skilton
  - Jones
  - Plotkin
  - Monaghan
  - TBA

**Prod. Suppt**
- Chapel
- Kinsale
- TBA

---

**Account Support**

*Sec. Movement, gifts, obtain tax cost acquisition dates

*Prep. open doc (IA), ensure complete doc is received (Omni/DAA), update Author.

files, maint. loan documentation,

Due Dilligence

*POINT OF CONTACT FOR SERVICING GROUPS

Receive and dist. instr from PSCG, submit req. to open a/c's, assign MMIA #', all ops inquiries

General Cash Support

Primary Function Type
- Administrative
- Client-focused
- Daily deadlines
- Multi-task oriented

**These working teams are responsible for controlling the whole account opening process and will be more interactive than most other working teams.**

---

**General Responsibilities**
- Central contact for most operational questions and requests from PSCG
- Cross-product, cross-functional inquiries and investigations
- Coordination with other operations groups (e.g. securities ops, MT, etc.)
- Coordination of account openings/closings
- Coordination with outside custodians and other external parties
- Standard calculations and transactions

**Primary Function Type**
- Administrative
- Client-focused
- Daily deadlines
- Multi-task oriented

**CROSS-FUNCTIONAL TEAM**
- Members possess working knowledge of all functions within group.

**WORKING TEAM**
- Members have specific concentrations/expertise
New Delaware PB Support Structure

Reporting

25

Accounting

13
Calc.
7 (6.24)
Humble (TL)
Becker
Yovino
Merten
Davis
Hersley
Campbell
Recon.
4 (4.51)
Callahan
J. Skilton (TL)
Mauldin
Betterly

CTF Admin
1
TBA
1/2 Zakreski

Legal
2 (2.36)
Shamwell
Mc Coale
TBA
TBA

Ad Hoc
3 (2.2)

Internal
7

External
5

Ad Hoc
1 (7)
Jenkins

*Retrievals, SRQM, Invest 3000

Mgt
4 (3.58)
Hinkson

DiMedio

1/2 Zakreski

*Customized reptg
off PBIS-Omni, P&L's,
axes under mgt, New
and Lost, internal reptg.,
mgt reptg (treas.),
investment comm.,
Audit

Confirms

3

T&I
2 (1.3)
Cross
TBA

*Class actions, money
manager stdg inst. broker
reports, Audit Confirms

*ICG ad-hoc, income
projections, out of bal
statements

General Responsibilities

Ad hoc client reporting
Special accountings
Regulatory reporting
Management reporting
Internal client reporting
Special calculations

Primary Function Type

Analytical
Client-focused
Periodic deadlines

Working Team - Members have
specific concentrations/expertise

CROSS-FUNCTIONAL TEAM - Members
possess working knowledge of all functions
within group.

3
New Delaware PB Support Structure

Management Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Information</th>
<th>Account Support</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 + 4 non reg</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary Support Teams**

- Processing
- Product/Disco
- Static Data
- Processing
- Document
- Inquiry
- Credit
- Product Supplies (Marine)
- Accounting
- External
- Internal

**Management Teams**

- McLaughlin
- Adams
- Lyon
- Frigley
- Hausler (pt)
- Roulston
- Raleigh
- Marine
- Quinn (pt)
New Delaware PB Support Structure
Administration

Cavazzini
Berger
Biasotto
Chung Rossiter
Copes
Merckling
Monahan (pt)
Pierce
Valania
Yerger

5