

THE EFFECT OF TEAMWORK ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: A STUDY OF MEDIUM SCALE INDUSTRIES IN ANAMBRA STATE

ONYEKWELU NJIDEKA PHINA

Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria

ANAH STANLEY ARINZE (Ph.D)

Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria

ONWUCHEKWA FAITH CHIDI (Ph.D)

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

EJIKE DANIEL CHUKWUMA

Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria

Abstract

This study explored the effect of team work on employee performance in an organization, using selected medium scale enterprises in Anambra State as the study area. As a descriptive survey, an item structured instrument which was developed by the researcher to reflect the Five (5) points modified Likert scale of strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree and undecided was used to elicit information from the respondents who were mainly senior employee of the organizations selected for the study. Major tools of analysis were summary statistics, pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis. Whereas summary statistics of percentages were used to answer the research questions, correlation coefficient and multiple regression analysis were used to verify the claims of the hypotheses. All tests were carried out of 0.05 level of significance. The findings showed that 80.7 percent relationship exist between the dependent and independent variables. It showed further that the coefficient of determination, $R^2 = 721$ thus indicating that 72.1 percent of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables. Also, the F-value showed that overall; regression model is statistically significant, valid and fit for any predictive purposes. Equally, the coefficients of the individual predictors of employee performance-team members' abilities, team esprit de corps, team trust, recognition and reward and their t-values showed varying degrees of positive relationship with the dependent variable. Consequently, it was recommended among others that managers should endeavour to ensure that each team in the organization compose of the necessary skills that will enable the teams to perform effectively without having too much of any of the skills in the team to the disadvantage of other necessary skills.

Keywords: Teamwork, Employee Performance, Organization

1. Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

Teamwork is viewed as work group with a common purpose for the achievement of goals/task (Harries and Harries, 1996). It implies therefore that individuals work in a cooperative environment in the interest of a common goal by sharing knowledge, skills and being flexible enough to serve multiple roles. It is a means of improving manpower utilization and potentially raising performance of not just the individuals but the organization ultimately, because it can expand the output of individuals through collaboration. Thus, employees who work in team become the standard for the organization (Alie, Bean and Carey, 1998). Nowadays, managers who know the value are assigning more team projects to employee with opportunities to strengthen their knowledge and develop their skills (Hartenian, 2003). Teamwork has the potential of improving the performance of individual employees and that of the organization, though, it needs to be nurtured over time (Ingram, 2000).

As have been explained by Robbins and Judge (2007), a work group is a group of employees that interact with each other primarily to share information and make decisions that assist individual members in carrying out their duties while a work team is a group of employees whose individual efforts result in a performance that is greater than the sum of their individual inputs. They added that teamwork helps employees to cooperate, enhance their skills, provide feedback and reduce individual conflicts. It has been widely acknowledged that the shift from working alone to working in teams, require employees to cooperate, share information, confront differences and sublimate personal interests for the greater good of the team. Teams may therefore be portrayed as effective work groups whose effectiveness rests on the degree of motivation, coordination and purpose and whose synergy produces an energy/creativity which is beyond them as individuals, hence, teams must possess a definable membership, group consciousness and a sense of shared purpose (Adair, 1988).

Within the context of teamwork and employee performance in an organization, we intend to explore the influence of the following as the components of the team and their influence on employee's job performance: abilities of members, esprit de corps, team trust as well as recognition and reward. Perceptive managers known and constantly capture the benefits of the team. As teams show the collective strength of the individual members, they boost the motivation and morale of individual as well. This in turn will create a high performance organization that is flexible, efficient and most importantly, profitable. Profitability is the key factor that will allow organization to continue to compete successfully in a tough, competitive and global business arena.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

There is sufficient evidence to prove that teamwork and its effect on employees' performance in an organization, has not attracted much research interest. This could be seen from the few available empirical works on the subject matter. Apart from this, the popular independent variables that have been used as components of teamwork to predict employee job performance from the few available studies, ranges from interpersonal skills to communication without consideration for the abilities of the members of the team, esprit de the corps, recognition and reward, etc, as factors that could better predict job performance of a teamwork. For example, Walid and Zubair (2016) studied the impact of effective teamwork on employee performance in a public sector organization in Malaysia, using communication, interpersonal skills, team cohesiveness and accountability as predictors of performance in a

teamwork. Also, Agwu (2015) carried out a study on teamwork and employee performance in the Bonny Nigeria. Liquefied Natural Gas Plant, Rivers State of Nigeria. The study measured teamwork against motivation/commitment, it also measured the relationship between teamwork and increased employee productivity.

This obvious gap has given impetus to this present study which has been designed to show how members' abilities in a team, level of trust for one another, esprit de corp, recognition and reward, can enhance the performance of the team in an organization.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study is to evaluate the effect of teamwork on employees' performance, using selected medium scale enterprises in Anambra State as the study area. Specifically however, the study examines:

- (i) The effect of team members' abilities on employee performance.
- (ii) The effect of team members' esprit de corps on employee performance.
- (iii) The effect of team members' trust on employee performance.
- (iv) The effect of recognition and reward on employee performance.

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions were considered very germane to the study and therefore they were raised to guide it.

- (i) How significant is the effect of team members' abilities on employee performance?
- (ii) How significant is the effect of team members' esprit de corps on employee performance?
- (iii) How significant is the effect of team members' trust on employee performance?
- (iv) How significant is the effect of team members' recognition and reward on performance?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated to guide the objectives of the study and strengthen the analysis:

- (i) Team members' abilities do not have any significant effect on employees' performance.
- (ii) Team members' esprit de corps do not have any significant effect on employees' performance.
- (iii) Team members' trust does not have any significant effect on employees' performance.
- (iv) Team members' recognition and reward do not have any significant effect on employees' performance.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The study has both theoretical and empirical significance. Theoretically, the study delved into examining the effect of teamwork on employee performance and as such team members' abilities, esprit de corps, trust, recognition and reward were analyzed to see their collective and individual contributions to performance in the organizations understudy. By so doing, the body of knowledge is enriched in this area of study. Also, empirically, the findings and policy dialogue that would follow will be of immense benefits to the following categories of stakeholders in the organizations.

- (i) The management: The management would be enlightened on the need to adopt the approach of teamwork in their organizations to take advantage of the efficiency and effectiveness of the employees drivable from the approach.
- (ii) The employees: The employees would be made to understand that the advantages in teamwork outweigh the disadvantage hence the need to ask for it.
- (iii) The students/researchers: This group will also benefit from the outcome of the study because it will serve as good starting point for those who might want to carry out further studies in the area.

1.7 Scope of the Study

The study covers medium scale organizations in Anambra State which clusters at the three main cities in the State namely Onitsha, Nnewi and Awka. However, there are others which locates at the suburbs of the State. Effect of teamwork on employee performance in an organization is the main issue under investigation. The study spanned six (6) months that is, January to June, 2017.

1.8 Limitations to the Study

The study was limited by the difficulties associated with the collection of primary data in this part of the world where companies always associate primary data collection to increase in levies, rates and taxes. Nevertheless, we used experience and subtle persuasion to overcome such problems and those of "refuse to answer" that is, the hard cores that we encountered in the process of data collection. There was also the problem of very few available empirical works in the area as could be seen in our empirical review section of our literature review.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The existing literature on teamwork and performance in the organization suggests that there is a positive link between the two variables. The emphasis on this link reflects the view that organizational market value depends less on tangible resources but rather largely on intangible ones, particularly teamwork (Stiles and Kulvisaerchana, 2005). Conti and Kelineer (2003) have also observed that teams offer greater participation, challenges and feelings of accomplishment. They noted further that organizations with teams will attract and retain the best people, which in turn will create a high performance organization that is flexible, efficient and most importantly, profitable.

2.1 Conceptual Review

Pearce and Robbins (1997) defined teams as groups of individuals who work together to accomplish a task/project. Also Salas, Dickinson, Converse and Tannenbaum (1992) have defined a team as a distinguishable set of two or more people who dynamically, interdependently and adaptively interact towards valued objective/mission/goal, which have been assigned each to perform a particular function or role with a limited life-span of

membership. In the same vein, Larson and Lafaston (1989) defined team as a unit of two or more people who coordinate and interact to complete and achieve one common and specific goal.

To Cohen and Bailey (1999), an employee team is a collection of individuals who are interdependent in the tasks and who share responsibility for the expected outcomes. They noted that it enables people to cooperate, enhance individual skills and provide constructive feedback without any conflict between individuals (Jones, Richard, Paul, Sloane and Peter, 2007). To Robbins and Judge (2007), work team refers to a group of people whose individual efforts result in a performance that is greater than the sum of the individual inputs.

On the other hand, performance has been presented in existing literature as a complex and multidimensional construct which can be defined and assessed in many ways. The concept 'performance' is derived from the word perform which is an act. Al-Jammal, Al-Khasawneh and Hamadat (2015) defined employee performance as the level of efforts and achievements exerted by employees. To Okunribido (2015), employee performance can be defined in terms of quantifiable outcomes of work behaviour and in terms of behavioural dimensions (e.g., work related communication, decision-making, attention to detail) that are less quantifiable. Therefore, as a multi-dimensional construct, the measurement of performance varies depending on a variety of factors (Bate and Holton, 2010). They concluded that it can be simply defined to mean the record of outcomes achieved among staff.

2.2 Theoretical Literature

2.2.1 Effect of Team Members Abilities on Employee Performance

Part of a team's performance depends on the knowledge, skills and abilities for its members. A team's performance is not merely the summation of its individual members' abilities. However, these abilities set parameters for what members can do and how effectively they will perform on a team (Robbins and Judge, 2007). In their opinions, to perform effectively, a team requires three different types of skills. First, it needs people with technical expertise. Second, it need people with the problem-solving and decision-making skills to be able to identify problems, generate alternatives, evaluate those alternatives and make competent choices. Finally, the teams need people with good listening, feedback, conflict resolution and other interpersonal skills, they added. They remarked further that no team can achieve its performance potential without developing all three types of skills. The right mix is crucial as too much of one at the expense of the others result in lower team performance. They noted that research on the abilities of team members has revealed some interesting insights into team composition and performance and they include the need to distribute work load evenly, ability to adapt prior knowledge to suit a set of new problems and the need to match team ability to the task.

2.2.2 Team's Esprit De Corps and Employee Performance

Esprit de corps is the feeling and viewpoint that employee holds about the group. It is also known as team spirit in which employees share their problems with each other within the organization (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993). They observed that team is composed of people who jointly depend on one another in order to achieve team objective, and that team spirit is composed of group members' feelings, beliefs and values. Additionally, team spirit in the organization is the key for success in achieving common goal of the team (Boyt, Busch and Mejza, 2005). In the opinions of William, Swee-Lim and Cesar (2005), esprit de corps is the key to success in an organization. To Homburg, Workman and Jensen (2002), esprit de corps

could be considered as a valuable asset for team members as well as the organization. However, in Pakistan, the concept of esprit de corps is not very much recognized as most managers and employees prefer to pursue their individual tasks rather than teamwork (Trimizi and Shahzad, 2009).

2.2.3 Team Trust and Employee Performance

Members of effective teams trust each other, and they also exhibit trust in their leaders. Interpersonal trust among team members facilitates cooperation (Robbins and Judge, 2007). Trust among the team members comes when members of the teams develop the confidence in each other competence. To Mickan and Rodger (2000), there is positive relationship between the team performance and trust. Trust generates the behavioural basis of teamwork, which results in organizational synergy and better performance of an employee. In their opinion, development of trust within the organization, is the responsibility of the individuals. Creation of conducive and the trustable environment for synergetic teamwork is the responsibility of organizations. They posited that organizations should transform the trustworthy behaviour for measurement into performance appraisal system to promote the organizational values. As Manz and Neck (2002) have remarked, high performance teams exist in the organization because there is cooperation and unity among members. Mistakes minimization, quality outputs, increase in productivity and ofcourse, customer satisfaction are the variety of criteria through which performance of the team is measured (Mickan and Rodger, 2000). They concluded that cooperation of the team members can only be created when the trust comes to the most important value of the team culture because it provides an atmosphere for team members to discuss mistakes, accept criticisms and freely express their feelings on any issue.

2.2.4 Effect of Recognition and Rewards on Employee Performance

Robbins and Judge (2007) stressed that reward system should encourage cooperative efforts rather than competitive ones. They opined that promotions, pay raises and other forms of recognition should be given to individuals for how effective they are as a collaborative team member. They pointed out that it does not imply that individual contributions are ignored, rather, they are balanced with selfless contributions to the team. They stated that examples of behaviours that should be rewarded include: training of new colleagues, sharing information with team mates, helping to resolve team conflicts and mastering new skills that the team needs but in which it is deficient.

In a related development, Rabey (2003) observes that recognition and rewards are the primary focus of the individuals who are working in teams. He reiterated that perceptive managers are quite aware of this and that they constantly capture the benefits of the team. As Herzberg (1987) have noted, reward and recognition can provide both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. However he is of the opinion that extrinsic reward is the main factor that provides employee movement in positive manner. Managers must plan and design an appropriate reward system for the employee and encourage their participation in team arrangements for effective performance to be achieved.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

The theory upon which this study is anchored is the HRM-performance linkage model of Becker and Huselid (1998) and Wright et al (2003) whose core philosophy suggests that teamwork has a direct impact on employee skills and motivation, which are subsequently translated into improved employee/organizational performance. The HRM-performance linkage model is based on the resource-based view (RBV) which states that increasing

employees' abilities and motivation, through teamwork will ultimately improve employee/organizational performance (Lopez et al, 2005). The RBV perspective advocates that the potential for competitive advantage of an organization is based on its ability to exploit the inimitable characteristics of its pool of human resources and capabilities.

The basic causal pathway of the HRM-performance linkage model is as stated below:

Teamwork → Skills → Attitudes → Behaviour → Employee Performance

Looking at the causal pathway illustrated above, the general framework of the model is indirect linkage or hierarchical linkage through the outcomes of skills, attitudes and behaviour between teamwork and employee performance (Black, 2001). Teamwork activities aimed at providing increased skills to employees has a direct impact on their attitudes: motivation, commitment and satisfaction (Barlett, 2001).

Relevance of the Theory

This theory/model was considered very relevant to the study because the issues involved in teamwork and employee performance could be explained within the framework of the theory. The central argument is that teamwork facilitates the acquisition of necessary skills which leads to enhanced performance of the team members in the organization. Every member of the team can never be equally endowed but through interaction and joint execution of task, the tendency is for the weak to learn from the strong members.

2.4 Empirical Review

In a study carried out by Boakye (2015) on the impact of teamwork on employee performance, using Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital and Ejisu Government Hospital, several measures of team performance were analyzed including teamtrust, recognition and rewards. The study used correlational techniques in order to analyze the relationship between the two variables, that is teamwork and organizational performance. The study found that teamwork is positively and significantly related to organizational performance. In another study, Manzoor, Ullah, Hussain and Ahmad (2011) worked on the effect of teamwork on employee performance, using the staff of higher education department of Khyber Pakhtoon Khawa, Peshawar Province of Pakistan. The study which was designed as descriptive survey design found that positive and significant relationship exist between teamwork and employee performance.

In a study undertaken by Jones, Richard, Paul, Sloane and Peter (2007) on the effect of team building in the organization, it was found that employees working within the team can produce more output as compared to individual effort. Also, in another study carried out by Ingram (2000) on linking teamwork with performance. It was found that a good manager is the one who assigns responsibilities to his/her employees in a form of group or team in order to take maximum output from the employees. In another study carried out by Conti and Kleiner (2003) on how to increase teamwork in an organization, it was found that teams offer greater participation, challenges and feeling of accomplishment. It was concluded that organizations with team will attract and retain the best people as employees.

In a related development Walid and Zubair (2016) carried out a study on impact of effective teamwork on employee performance, using the entertainment company in Kuala Lumpur capital of Malaysia as the study area. The study adopted descriptive and exploratory research design. The result showed that efficient communication, level of trust, leadership and accountability, has positive and significant impact on employee performance while

intrapersonal skills and cohesiveness has no influence on employee performance. Similarly, Agwu (2015) conducted a study to determine the effect of teamwork on employee performance in the Liquidified Natural Gas Plant, Bonny, Nigeria. The study adopted descriptive research design. Result from data analysis indicates that significant relationship exist between teamwork and employee performance. It was concluded that the current team building in the plant should be sustained.

Ooko (2013) did a study on impact of teamwork on the achievement of targets in organizations in Kenya, using SOS children's village, Eldoret was the study area. The study adopted descriptive research design. The study found that job satisfaction was to be achieved through recognition of achievement, promotions, good working environments and fair rewards and remunerations. This was to impact team performance if it was done correctly. It was concluded that there was no effective teamwork at SOS despite employees being aware of how much they can achieve by working together in teams. Also, Teseema and Soeters (2006) did a study on promotion practice of teams in an organization and found that there is positive relationship between promotion practice for teams and perceived performance of employees.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

We discussed the method and procedure used in carrying out this study in this section under the following sub-headings; research design, area of the study, nature and sources of data, population of the study, determination of sample size, sample and sampling technique, method of data collection, validity of the instrument, reliability of the instrument and method of data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

The study adopted descriptive survey design because as a sample survey, the results would be generalized for the entire population of interest. Ikeagwu (1997) notes that studies of this nature use the survey method to look for information on facts, attitudes, practices and opinions of the respondents on the issues surrounding the subject matter of the investigation. To Obasi (1999), the use of survey is always adopted because it provides an important means of gathering information especially when the necessary data cannot be found in statistical records in form of secondary data.

3.2 Area of the Study

The area of study is Anambra State, one of the five states of the South-East geo-political zone of Nigeria. The state is bounded in the North by Kogi State, Imo and Abia States in the South, Enugu State in East and Delta and Rivers States in the West. The area cuts across three senatorial districts in the State namely; Anambra North, Anambra Central and Anambra South Senatorial Districts.

3.3 Nature and Sources of Data

The data for the study came from two sources namely secondary and primary sources. Whereas the secondary came from academic journals and other published works in academics, the primary data were collected from the administration of the copies of the questionnaire to the respondents.

3.4 Population of the Study

The population of the study comprised the senior staff of medium scale enterprises (MSEs) in Anambra State. This category of staff were chosen to ensure that respondents possess the

knowledge and experience necessary to be able to discuss all issues relating to employee Teamwork and performance in an organization. A total of 2059 employees of this category is identified across the organizations selected for the study.

3.5 Determination of Sample Size

Borg and Gall formula for sample size determination developed in 1973 was used to determine the sample size for this study as follows:

$$n = (z_{\alpha})^2(e)[N]$$

Where:

- n = Sample size to be determined
- N = entire population of interest
- e = acceptable error margin
- α = significance level (0.05)
- Z_{α} = confidence level (1.960)

Substituting in the formula we have:

$$\begin{aligned}n &= (1.960)^2(0.05)[2059] \\ &= 3.8416 \times 102.95 \\ &= 395.49272\end{aligned}$$

$\therefore n = 395$ (Nearest whole number).

Thus, the sample size for the study is 295 senior staff of the organizations.

3.6 Sampling Technique

With respect to the selection of units of observation, purposive sampling method was used to select the respondents from the medium scale firms across the state. This sampling technique was used to ensure that the need types of personnel only were included in the sample.

3.7 Method of Data Collection

An item structured instrument of the five points modified Likert Scale of strongly agree, agree, disagreed, strongly disagree and undecided, was developed by the researcher to collect data from the respondents on various issues surrounding employees' teamwork and performance. The data used for the study were substantially primary data and as such, they were collected through direct administration of the instrument to the respondents. The choice of this method was informed by the advantages it has over other methods. Firstly, it afforded the researcher the opportunity of assessing whether the respondents understood the questionnaire items. Secondly, it reduced the volume of non-response which often associates with surveys of this nature and thirdly, it made it possible for the researcher to make explanations or clarifications where necessary. Out of the 395 copies of the questionnaire issued out, 353 were completed and returned thus showing a response rate of 89.4 percent.

3.8 Validity of the Instrument

The instrument was validated by the supervisor and some experts in the field to ensure that the instrument contains all the aspects of the subject matter. The supervisor and the experts made some valid correlations on the instrument and they were reflected in the final draft.

3.9 Reliability of the Instrument

The reliability of the instrument was established through a pilot study commissioned by the researcher. The process involved giving 20 copies of the instrument to 20 people selected out the organizations being studied to complete. After an interval of two weeks, the same

instrument was administered to the same group of people. Both the first and second responses were collated and analyzed through the application of Spearman rank order correlation coefficient. The exercise returned the following coefficients for the four research questions: 0.73, 0.90, 0.80 and 0.80 (see Appendix II for details) respectively thus showing an average coefficient of 0.75 which implies that the instrument is 75 percent consistent and reliable.

3.10 Method of Data Analysis

Summary Statistics of Percentages were used to answer the research questions while Pearson product moment correlation coefficient and multiple regression analysis were used to conduct the test of hypothesis. The software package is SPSS 16.0. All tests were carried out at 0.05 level of significance.

3.11 Model Specification

The study examined the effect of teamwork on employee performance in an organization. In the light of this, the model to be estimated was specified thus:

$$\text{Employee Performance} = f(\text{MA, EDC, TT, R \& R}) \quad - \quad - \quad - \quad (1)$$

Specifying econometrically we have:

$$EP = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1\text{MA} + \alpha_2\text{EDC} + \alpha_3\text{TT} + \alpha_4\text{R\&R} + M_T \quad - \quad - \quad - \quad (2)$$

Where:

- EP = Employee performance
- MA = Team members abilities
- EDC = Esprit De Corps
- TT = Team trust
- R&R = Recognition and Reward

The expected signs of the coefficients or *a priori* are:

$$\alpha_1 > 0; \alpha_2 > 0; \alpha_3 > 0 \text{ and } \alpha_4 > 0.$$

$$\alpha_{is} > 0$$

The mathematical expression of the inequality as stated above indicate that there would be direct or positive relationship between the dependent and independent variables. Furthermore, as employee performance is expected to depend on the independent variables, it implies that the independent variables can be called predictors variables.

4. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

In this section, efforts were made to present and analyze the data generated in this study in two sub-sections namely; answer to the research questions and test of hypothesis. Whereas summary statistics of percentages were applied to the responses of the Likert scale format, to answer the research questions, Pearson product moment coefficient and multiple regression analysis were used to verify the hypotheses which were formulated to strengthen the analysis and guide the objectives of the study.

4.1 Answer to Research Questions

Efforts were made here to analyze and provide answers to the research questions through the tools of analysis stated above. This precisely was meant to capture the extent that respondents agreed or disagreed with the statement of a given item of the questionnaire.

Research Question One:

Table 4.1: Effect of Team members abilities on Employee Performance

S/N	Item	Alternative Responses	Total
-----	------	-----------------------	-------

		SA	A	D	SD	UND	
1.	Part of a team's performance depends on the knowledge, skills and abilities of its individual members.	140 (39.7)	159 (45.0)	27 (7.6)	17 (4.8)	10 (2.8)	353 (100)
2.	Team members abilities set parameters for what members can do and how effectively the can perform on it.	151 (42.8)	153 (43.3)	25 (7.1)	14 (4.0)	10 (2.8)	353 (100)
3.	A team must contain those with technical expertise to be able to perform effectively.	139 (39.4)	156 (44.2)	30 (8.5)	15 (4.2)	13 (3.7)	353 (100)
4.	A team must contain those with problem solving and quick decision-making skills in order to be effective.	149 (42.2)	150 (42.5)	35 (9.9)	10 (2.8)	9 (2.5)	353 (100)
5.	A team need people with good listening, feedback, conflict resolution and other interpersonal skills.	145 (41.1)	155 (43.9)	23 (6.5)	20 (5.7)	10 (2.8)	353 (100)
Total		724	773	140	76	52	1,756
Percentage of Total		(41.0)	(43.8)	(7.9)	(4.3)	(2.9)	(100)

Note: (SA = Strongly agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree and UND = Undecided)
: Figures in Parenthesis are percentages

As could be seen from Table 4.1, on the average, 41.0 percent of the respondents strongly agreed with all the statement of the items, 43.8 percent merely agreed, 7.9 percent disagreed, 4.3 percent strongly disagreed and 2.9 percent of them had no opinion on the issues raised.

Research Question Two:

Table 4.2: Effect of Esprit De Corps in a Team on Employee Performance

S/N	Item	Alternative Responses					Total
		SA	A	D	SD	UND	
1.	Esprit De corps in an organization is a situation in which group of people jointly depend on one another in order to achieve team objective.	139 (39.4)	158 (44.8)	30 (8.5)	16 (4.5)	10 (2.8)	353 (100)
2.	The team spirit of sharing problems among members in an organization enhances performance.	144 (40.8)	149 (42.2)	35 (10.0)	15 (4.2)	10 (4.0)	353 (100)
3.	Esprit De Corps is a valuable asset for team members as well as the organization, as two good heads are better than one.	148 (41.9)	150 (42.5)	27 (7.6)	18 (5.1)	10 (2.8)	353 (100)
4.	Positive relationship exist between esprit de corps and employee job satisfaction.	147 (41.6)	155 (43.9)	25 (7.1)	16 (4.5)	10 (2.8)	353 (100)
5.	Team spirit and the desire to success brings out the best in employees toward enhanced performance.	150 (42.5)	151 (42.8)	23 (6.5)	15 (4.2)	14 (4.0)	353 (100)

Total	738	763	140	80	54	1,756
Percentage of Total	(41.2)	(43.2)	(7.9)	(4.5)	(3.1)	(100)

Note : Figures in Parenthesis are percentages
: (SA = Strongly agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree and UND = Undecided)

The analysis of the research question two presented in Table 4.2 shows that on the average, 41.2 percent of the respondent strongly agreed with all the statement of the items, 43.2 percent agreed, 7.9 percent agreed, 4.5 percent strongly disagreed while 3.1 percent were undecided on the whole issues raised in the section.

Research Question Three:

Table 4.3: Team Trust and Employee Performance

S/N	Item	Alternative Responses					Total
		SA	A	D	SD	UND	
1.	Team trust allow members to fully accept each other's strengths and weakness.	159 (45.0)	139 (39.4)	30 (8.5)	15 (4.2)	10 (2.8)	353 (100)
2.	Team trust facilitates facilities the achievement of harmony by avoiding conflict.	150 (42.5)	151 (42.8)	23 (6.5)	15 (4.2)	14 (4.0)	353 (100)
3.	Trust among team members develop the unique skills and coordination of individuals.	147 (41.6)	155 (43.9)	26 (7.4)	20 (5.7)	5 (1.4)	353 (100)
4.	Team trust generates the behavioural basis of teamwork which results in organizational synergy and bitter performance.	139 (39.4)	160 (45.3)	20 (5.7)	24 (6.8)	10 (2.8)	353 (100)
5.	Trust provides an atmosphere for the team members to discuss their mistakes, accept criticisms and freely express their feelings which enhances synergy.	159 (45.0)	160 (45.3)	20 (5.7)	10 (2.8)	4 (1.1)	353 (100)
Total		754	765	119	84	43	1,756
Percentage of Total		(42.7)	(43,3)	(6.7)	(4.8)	(2.4)	(100)

Note : Figures in Parenthesis are percentages
: (SA = Strongly agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree and UND = Undecided)

From Table 4.3, 42.7 percent of the respondents on the average strongly agreed with all the statement of the items, 43.3 percent merely agreed, 6.7 percent disagreed, 4.8 percent disagreed and 2.4 percent were indifferent.

Research Question Four:

Table 4.4: Effect of Recognition and Reward on Performance

S/N	Item	Alternative Responses					Total
		SA	A	D	SD	UND	

		SA	A	D	SD	UND	
1.	Team members expect recognition or reward for job well done.	150 (42.5)	157 (44.5)	28 (7.9)	10 (2.8)	8 (2.3)	353 (100)
2.	Managers must plan an appropriate reward system for the team members and encourage effective participation in the team.	149 (42.2)	153 (43.3)	30 (8.5)	11 (3.1)	10 (2.8)	353 (100)
3.	Managers must set the team goals and make them connected to rewards in order to get the best from the team.	157 (44.5)	149 (42.2)	25 (9.9)	7 (2.0)	5 (1.4)	353 (100)
4.	Reward and recognition can provide both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.	160 (45.3)	137 (38.8)	27 (7.6)	19 (5.4)	10 (2.8)	353 (100)
5.	Rewards in a team should focus on cooperative efforts rather than competitive ones.	143 (40.5)	161 (45.6)	23 (6.5)	16 (4.5)	10 (2.8)	353 (100)
Total		759	757	143	63	43	1,756
Percentage of Total		(41.2)	(43.2)	(7.9)	(4.5)	(3.1)	(100)

Note : Figures in Parenthesis are percentages
: (SA = Strongly agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree and UND = Undecided)

The analysis in Table 4.4 shows that 43 percent of the respondents on the average, strongly agreed with all the statement of the items, 42.9 percent of them merely agreed, 8.1 percent disagreed, 3.7 percent strongly disagreed while 2.4 percent were undecided on all the issues raised in the items.

Research Question Five:

Table 4.5: Employee Job Performance: Dependent Variable

S/N	Item	Alternative Responses					Total
		SA	A	D	SD	UND	
1.	To what extent are you able to perform effectively and understand a complete job description?	158 (44.8)	174 (49.3)	10 (2.8)	6 (1.7)	5 (1.4)	353 (100)
2.	To what extent do you understand job performance requirements and standard that you all expected to meet?	161 (45.6)	175 (49.6)	9 (2.5)	5 (1.4)	3 (0.8)	353 (100)
3.	To what extent does your superior or supervisor review your job description and performance requirements?	165 (46.7)	169 (47.8)	10 (2.8)	5 (1.4)	4 (1.1)	353 (100)
4.	To what extent is your job performance reviewed and rescheduled?	168 (47.6)	170 (48.2)	15 (42.5)	-	-	353 (100)
5.	To what extent does your job description	159	173	9	7	5	353

and competencies accurately reflect the reality of your position?	(45.0)	(49.0)	(2.5)	(2.0)	(1.4)	(100)
Total	811	861	53	23	17	1765
Percentage of Total	(45.9)	(48.8)	(3.0)	(1.3)	(1.0)	(100)

Note : Figures in Parenthesis are percentages
: (SA = Strongly agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree and UND = Undecided)

Table 4.5 presents the opinion of the respondents on performance which is the outcome of teamwork. As could be seen from the table, 45.9 percent of the respondents agreed with all the items to a very great extent, 48.8 percent said to a great extent, 3.0 percent said to a little extent and 1 percent said to a very little extent. The implication here is that almost all the employees agreed that the arrangement enhances their performance in their respective organizations.

4.2 Test of Hypotheses

As a tentative answer to the problem of the research under investigation and an answer which has no evidence supporting it until a full investigation is carried out, the hypotheses formulated to guide the study were tested in this section of the analysis.

Re-Statement of the Hypotheses

- H₀: Team members abilities do not have any significant effect on employees performance.
H₁: Team members abilities have significant effect on employees performance.
- H₀: Team members esprit de corps do not have any significant effect on employees performance.
H₁: Team members esprit de corps t have any significant effect on employees performance.
- H₀: Team members trust does not have any significant effect on employees performance.
H₁: Team members trust do have any significant effect on employees performance.
- H₀: Team members recognition and reward do not have any significant effect on employee performance.
H₁: Team members recognition and reward do have any significant effect on employee performance.

Table 4.6: Correlation Matrix

	Team Members Abilities	Team Members Esprit De Corps	Team Members Trust	Team Members Recognition and Reward
Team Member Pearson Correlation	1	.817**	.537**	.549**

Abilities	Sig.(2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	353	353	.353	353
Team Esprit De Corps	Pearson Correlation	.817**	1	.613**	.481**
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	353	353	353	353
Team Members Trust	Pearson Correlation	.537**	.613**	1	.181*
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.000	.000		0.17
	N	353	353	353	353
Recognition &Reward	Pearson Correlation	.549**	.481**	.181*	.471
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.000	.000	.017	
	N	353	353	353	353

** Correlation is Significant at 0.05 Level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 6 shows correlation matrix of team members abilities, esprit de corps, team trust, recognition and reward. The analysis shows that there is strong positive and significant relationship between dependent variable and the independent variables at both 0.01 and 0.05 levels.

Table 4.7: Model Summary of Dependent and Independent Variables
ANOVA^b

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio	Sig.
Regression	4	125.821	31.455	27.836	.000 ^a
Residual	95	107.392	1.130		
Total	99	233.213			

a. Predictor: (constant), Abilities of members, esprit de corps, trust, recognition and reward.

b. Dependent variable: Employee Performance

Table 4.7 shows that the F-value is 27.836 and it is significant because the significance level is .000 which is less than $P \leq 0.05$. This result implies that overall, regression model is statistically significant, valid and fit. Thus showing that all independent variables are positively related to the independent variables.

Table 4.8: Summary of Regression Result

Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Standard Error of the Estimate
1	0.807	0.721	0.709	0.75138

a. Predictor: (constant), Abilities of members, esprit de corps, trust, recognition and reward

From Table 4.8, regression coefficient represented by 'R', shows that 80.7 percent relationship exists between dependent variable and independent variables. The coefficient of determination, $R^2 = .721$ shows that 72.1 percent of variation in employee performance is explained by the independent variables.

Table 4.9: Summary of Coefficient of Team Members Abilities, Esprit De Corps, Trust, Recognition and Rewards

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
-------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	---	------

	β	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	-.173	.204		-.865	.378
Team Members Abilities	.613	.057	.622	10.498	.000
Esprit de corps	.174	.050	.451	3.577	.000
Team Trust	.165	.047	.650	3.089	.004
Recognition & Reward	.112	.56	.515	1.950	.030

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Interpretation of Results

The regression results are interpreted with respect to coefficients of beta (β), t and other parameters in the regression model as follows: As could be seen in Table 4.9, the values of the regression coefficients show their relative weights in the prediction of the dependent variable (employee performance). For example, team members abilities represented by α_1 in the model has a coefficient of .622 which means that a unit increase team members abilities will lead to 62.2 percent increase in employee performance when other variables are held constant. The t-value is 10.498 and it is significant at .000. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative which suggests that team members abilities has significant effect on employee performance was accepted.

In the same vein, regression coefficient for esprit de corps represented by α_2 in the model is .451 which means that increase in esprit de corps by one unit will lead to 45.1 percent increase in employee performance if other variables are not allowed to vary. Similarly, the t-value which is 3.575 shows that the result is significant because, .000 is less than 0.05. Therefore, given the weight of evidence against the null hypothesis, it was rejected while the alternative which suggests team esprit de corps affects employee performance significantly was accepted.

Also, the coefficient team trust which was represented by α_3 is .650 which means that a unit increase team trust will increase employees performance by 65 percent when all other variables are held constant. The t-value is 3.089 and it is significant because .004 is less than 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative which suggests that team trust influences employees performance significantly was accepted.

The coefficient of recognition and reward which is represented by α_4 is .515 which means that one unit increase in recognition and reward will increase employees performance by 51.5 percent. Also, the t-value which is 1.950 is significant because 0.030 is less than 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative which suggests that team recognition and reward can performance significantly was accepted.

Table 4.1: Eigen Values, Condition Index and Variance Proportions

Model	Eigen value	Condition Index		Variance Proportions			
			Constant	TMA	EDC	TT	R&R
1	4.617	1.002	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
2	.109	6.677	.15	.09	.17	.34	.03
3	.094	7.178	.06	.05	.48	.05	.49
4	.056	10.105	.69	.16	.21	.23	.37
5	.048	11.425	.23	.67	.26	.57	.25

a. Dependent variable: Employee Performance

Specifications: eigen values close to zero indicate dimensions which explain little variance. For the condition index, when the values are more than 15 for any variable, it indicates a possibility of multicollinearity. In the table however, the values of 2, 3, 4 and 5 in the model are close to zero which shows little variable in the table. As for condition index, the values are in the range of 1.002 to 11.425 thus indicating no-presence of multicollinearity between dependent and independent variables.

Table 4.11: Multicollinearity Diagnosis between Dependent and Independent Variables

Variables	Tolerance	Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)
Constant		
Team Members Abilities	.451	2.378
Esprit de corps	.913	1.237
Team Trust	.477	2.056
Recognition and Reward	.785	1.265

Table 4.11 shows multicollinearity statistics. The tolerance values less than 0.20 or 0.10 indicate presence of multicollinearity problem (O'Brien and Rober, 2007). In the table above, the tolerance values of all the independent variables show that the tolerance level is good. Also, the reciprocal of tolerance known as the variance inflation factor (VIF), shows there is no presence of multicollinearity because the variables presented VIF of up to 5 as specified by 'O'Brien and Robert, 2007).

Discussion of Research Results

In discussing the research findings, we looked at the responses to the research questions by the responds, correlation results and the results of the test of hypotheses which were basically conducted through the Estimation of multiple regression coefficients and the t-values. As could be seen from Tables 4.1 to 4.5, greater percentage of the respondents agreed with all the statement of the items. Also, the result of the Pearson Correlation analysis presented in Table 4.6 shows that the dependent variables positively relate to the independent variables and among independent variables without showing any sign of multicollinearity or authogonal.

The regression coefficient represented by 'R', shows that about 80.7 percent relationship exist between the dependent and independent variables. The coefficient of determination, $R^2 = .721$, shows that 72.1 percent variation in employee performance, the dependent variable, can be explained by predictors. Similarly, the F-value showed that overall, regression model is statistically significant, valid and fit for any predictive purposes. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected in all the cases given the weight of evidence against them while the alternative hypothesis was accepted in each case. However, team trust presented the highest coefficient of .650 which means that when team trust is increased employee performance would be further enhance.

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Summary

The study examined the effect of team work on employee performance in an organization, using selected medium scale enterprises (MEs) in Anambra State as the study area. As a

descriptive survey design, primary data were principally used in the analysis. Major tools of analysis were summary statistics, Pearson Correlation Coefficient and Multiple regression analysis. Answer to the research question indicate that majority of the respondents agreed with all the issues raised in the items. Correlation analysis showed that strong and positive relationship exist between dependent and independent variables and among the independent variables. Overall, regression coefficients for all the predictor variables indicate that significant relation exist looking at the t-values and the significance levels. Also, they are all properly signed. The model is fit and valid for any predictive purposes when we consider the F-value which measures the overall significance of the model.

5.1 Conclusion

The result of data analysis and the discussion thereafter has revealed the importance of team work arrangement in the organization. Team was found to have positive and significant impact on employee performance and this brings benefits in terms of higher productivity, better organizational performance, competitive advantages and increased product quality and quantity. When an employee is in a team, his or her performance is automatically improved and invariably, job satisfaction is also enhanced. Team offers better utilization of skills and reduces the tendency to quit. For teams to perform effectively, there is need for some team members to possess levels of skills such as technical expertise, problem solving and decision-making as well as interpersonal skills. No team can achieve its performance potential without developing all three types of skills mentioned above.

5.1 Recommendations

Based on the analysis of data, the results and the discussion of the results, the conclusions that were drawn, we were able to make the following recommendations:

1. Team members abilities have positive effect on employees performance in an organization. Managers should therefore endeavour to ensure that each team compose of the necessary skills that will enable the team to perform effectively without having too much of each skill to the disadvantage of others.
2. Team's esprit de corps is a situation in which a group of people jointly depend on one another. This should be strengthened by making sure that people of like minds are put together in a team so that the organization can enjoy the full potential of such teams.
3. Team trust has the highest coefficient in the model thus showing the relative importance of trust in a team. When all appearances of mistrust, distrust and suspicion are reduced, the right atmosphere for increased/enhanced productivity from the employees will prevail.
4. Recognition and reward in a team should be encouraged by the organization but caution must be exercised to ensure that cooperative efforts rather than competitive ones are recognized and appreciated to achieve the desired optimal performance from the employees.

REFERENCES

- Adair, J. (1988). The action-centred leader. *The Industrial Society*, London: Pearson Educational Inc.
- Agwu, M.O. (2015). Teamwork and employee performance in Bonny Nigeria Liquified Natural Gas Plant. *Strategic Management Quarterly*, 3(4): 39-60.
- Alie, R.E., Bean, H. and Carey, T.A. (1998). The use of teams in an undergraduate management program. *Journal of Management Education*, 22(6): 707-719.

- Al-Jammal, H.R., Al-Khasawneh, A.L. and Hamadat, M.H. (2015). The Impact of delegation of authority on employees' performance at Great Irbid Municipality: Case Study. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 5(3): 139-145.
- Bartlett, K.R. (2001). The relationship between training and organizational commitment: a study in the health care field. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(4): 335-352.
- Bates, R.A. and Holton, E.F. (2010). Computerized Performance Monitoring: a review of human resource issues. *Human Resource Management Review*, Winter, pp. 256-267.
- Becker, B.E. and Huselid, M.A. (1998). High performance work systems and firm's performance: a synthesis of research and managerial implications. In G.R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and human resource*. Stannford, CT: JAI.
- Black, W.C. (2001). Invited reaction: the influence of individual characteristics and the work environment on varying levels of training outcomes. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(1): 25-31.
- Boakye, E.O. (2015). *The impact of teamwork on employee performance*, University of Ghana.
- Boyt, T., Lusch, R.F. and Mejza, M. (2005). Theoretical Model of antecedents and consequences of organizational work group and professional esprit de corps. *European Journal of Management*, 23(6): 682-701.
- Conti, B. and Kleiner, B. (2003). How to increase teamwork in organization. *Journal of Quality*, 5(1): 26-29.
- Harries, P.R. and Harries, K.G. (1996). Managing effectively through teams. *Team Performance Management*, 2(3): 123-26.
- Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: how do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, January-February: 53-63.
- Homburg, C., Workman, J.P. Jr and Jensen, O. (2002). A configurational perspective on key account management. *Journal of marketing*, 66:38-60.
- Ikeagwu, K.I. (1997). Groundwork of research methods and procedures. *Institute of Development Studies*, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus.
- Ingram, H. (2000). Linking teamwork with performance. *Journal of Team Performance Management*, 2(4): 5-10.
- Jaworky, B. and Kohli, A. (1993). Marketing Orientation: antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing*, 5(3): 35-37.
- Jones, A., Richard, B., Paul, D., Sloana, K. and Peter, F. (2007). Effectiveness of team building in the organization. *Journal of Management*, 5(3): 35-37.
- Larson, C.E. and Lafesto, F.M.J. (1989). *Teamwork*, Sage, Thousand Oaks (Accessed 4 Sept., 2015).

- Lopez, S.P., Peon, J.M.M. and Ordas, C.J.V. (2005). Human resource practices, organizational learning and business performance. *Human Resource Development International*, 8(2): 147-164.
- Manz, C. and Neck, S. (2002). Team think: beyond the group think syndrome in self-managing workteams. *Journal of Team Performance Management*.
- Manzoor, R., Ullah, H., Hussain, M. and Ahmad, Z.M. (2011). Effect of teamwork on employee performance. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 1(1): 110-126.
- Mickan, S. and Rodger, S. (2000). The organizational context for teamwork: comparing healthcare and business literature. *Australian Health Review*, 23(1): 179-192.
- O'Brien, R.M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factor. *Quality and Quantity*, 41(5): 673-690.
- Obasi, I.N. (1999). *Research Methodology in Political Science*. Enugu: Academic Publishing Company.
- Okunribido, M.O. (2015). Intellectual capital and employee performance of selected manufacturing bottling companies in Lagos State. A Masters Degree Thesis of the Department of Business Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.
- Ooko, A.P. (2013). Impact of teamwork on the achievement of targets in organizations in Kenya. A study of SOS Children's villages, Eldoret. A Masters Degree Thesis Submitted to the University of Nairobi.
- Pearce, R. and Robbins, S.P. (1997). *Strategic Management Formulation, Implementation and Control*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Rabey, G. (2003). The paradox of teamwork. *Journal of Industrial and Commercial Training*, 35(4): 158-162.
- Robbins, S.P. and Judge, T.A. (2007). *Organizational behaviour*, Twelfth edition, New Jersey Pearson Educational Inc.
- Salas, E., Dickinson, T.L., Converse, S.A. and Tannenbaum (1992). *Towards an understanding of team performance and training teams: their training and performance*. PP. 3-29. (Accessed 4th Sept., 2015).
- Stiles, P. and Kulvisaechana, S. (2005). *Human Capital and Performance: a literature review*. Judge Institute of Management, University of Cambridge, UK.
- Tirmizi, M.A. and Shazad, M.H.S. (2009). Is it industry productive: a performance based investigation of IT Sector firms operating in Pakistan? *International Journal of Business Management*, 4(5): 29-44.
- Walid, A.S. and Zubair, H. (2016). Impact of effective teamwork on employee performance. *International Journal of Accounting, Business and Management*, 4(1): 77-86.

William, D.R., Swee-Lim, C. and Cesar, M. (2005). Job insecurity and spillover to key account management: Negative effects on performance, effectiveness, adaptiveness and esprit de corps. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19 (4): 483-503.