



THE EFFECTS OF TEAMWORK ON EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE:
A STUDY OF SELECTED FIRMS IN ANAMBRA STATE NIGERIA

MBAH, Stella Ifeyinwa

Department of Business Administration,

Anambra State University Igbariam Campus, Anambra State Nigeria

ABSTRACT

This study is focused on the effect of teamwork on employee performance. The main objective of the study was to examine the influence of teamwork on employees' performance in selected firms in Anambra state. The descriptive survey design was adopted for the study. The sample size of 204 was determined using Taro Yemani's formula for determining sample size. The analysis was done using statistical tests such as correlation and regression to determine the degree of association between teamwork and employee performance. Major findings showed that there is a positive and strong relationship between teamwork, rewards and recognition of employees, team trust, Spirit de corps and employees' performance in an organization. The study also found that better organizational performance, competitive advantage and increased product quality could be achieved from teamwork. The study recommended that policies that support teamwork in organizations should be promoted. Employers should develop an atmosphere where employees are well satisfied with their jobs and in perfect relationship with team mates.

Keywords: Performance, Team trust, Recognition, Reward Productivity.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is difficult to arrive at a single definition of what constitutes teamwork. Several concepts exist and researchers in the field of working conditions differ in their view of what teamwork actually means. Work organizations using teamwork can refer to a wide range of possibilities, such as quality circles, cross-functional teams, self-managing teams or virtual teams. Many employers provide teamwork with varying degrees of autonomy.

Teamwork is defined by Harris and Harris (1996) "as a work group unit with a common purpose through which members develop mutual relationships for the achievement of goals and tasks". Teamwork implies that individuals work in a co-operative environment in the interest of a common goal by sharing knowledge, skills and being flexible enough to serve multiple roles. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the form of teamwork depends on task specificity. According to the definition proposed by Hackers (1998), a distinctive feature of teamwork at the assembly line is successive work actions to assemble different parts of a product. On the other hand, where the goal is to improve the production process, group teamwork is much more about complexity, communication and integrative work (O'Leary-Kelly, 1994). However, for the purpose of this study, teamwork is understood in a broader

context without drawing a distinction between teams and work groups; it thus encompasses the following definitions.

According to Robbins and Judge (2007), work group is a group that interacts primarily to share information and to make decisions to help each member perform within his or her area of responsibility. On the other hand, a work team is a group whose individual efforts result in a performance that is greater than the sum of the individual inputs. Thus the distinguishing factors are enhanced individual's performance within the group and better performance as a result of collective efforts respectively. Also, Delarue (2003) has tried to make a distinction between team and group. Whereas he classified team work as a group of employees who have at least some collective tasks and where the team members are authorized to regulate mutually the execution of these executive tasks, he sees group work as a common task requiring interdependent work and successive or integrative action. A work team generates positive synergy through a coordinated effort. Their individual efforts result in a level of performance that is greater than the sum of those individual inputs as Robbins and Judge had noted.

In this era of increased competition, leaders recognize the importance of teamwork more than ever before. Teams can expand the outputs of individuals through collaboration. Employees who are working in teams become the standard for the organization (Alie, Bean and Carey, 1998). It is a means of improving manpower utilization and potentially raising performance of not just the individual but the organization ultimately. With a support from upper level management, an employee works confidently in teams and increases productivity of the organization. Nowadays, in the new business world, managers are assigning more team projects to employees with opportunities to strengthen their knowledge and develop their skills (Hartenian, 2003)

Recent studies such as Jones, Richard, Paul, Sloane & Peter (2009) shows that employees working within the team can produce more output as compared to an individual. A few trends influenced employee jobs as much as the massive movement to introduce teams into the workplace. The shift from working alone to working on teams require employees to co-operate with others, share information, confront differences, and sublimate personal interests for the greater good of the team. Effective teams according to Robbins and Judge (2007) have been found to have common characteristics. They have adequate resources effective leadership, a climate of trust, and a performance evaluation and reward system that reflects team contributions. The teams have an individual with technical expertise as well as problem-solving, decision-making, and interpersonal skills; and high scores on the personality characteristics of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability they remarked.

Personal experience and evidence from the available literature on performance management in organizations indicate that very few research efforts have been made towards the concept of teamwork and its impact on employees' performance in Nigeria and particularly Anambra State. However, two of the few studies conducted on teamwork and employee's performance reported findings that suggest negative influence from the concept. For instance, one of the studies done by Morgan and Tindale in 2002 titled "Group versus individual performance in mixed-motive situations: Exploring the efficiency in Teamwork", showed that individuals can hide inside a group. They can engage in social loafing and coast on the group's effort because their individual contributions cannot be identified. Another study carried out by Manz and Neck in 2004 titled "Teamthink: Beyond the group think syndrome in self-managing work teams", found that teamwork increases conflict levels on the team. Relationship conflicts-those based on interpersonal incompatibilities, tension, and animosity towards others, are almost always dysfunctional. Apart from these few dissenting voices, some scholars have insisted that teamwork is an effective way of achieving a high productivity rate in an organization. Besides those conflicting reports, most of the earlier studies had adopted a qualitative approach. A study adopting quantitative design and

regression analysis would certainly yield findings, which could serve as key mediators among the conflicting results about teamwork and employees' performance in the organization.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The challenge for companies nowadays is to deliver quickly and flexibly new quality products and services, in order to respond efficiently to greater and challenging demands from clients. Standardization and specialization characterize the traditional work organization; the work is divided into different segments, from preparation to support roles, in which workers specialize in order to achieve optimal productivity. However, for a fast changing demand; this method does not seem to work as well, and may lead to coordination problems and rigidities. Thus, companies have started to look for new forms of work organization that would encourage good interpersonal relationships to achieve higher workplace performance (Delarue and De Prins, 2004). The study, therefore focuses on the extent to which teamwork can enhance employees' performance in organizations particularly in Anambra state.

1.2 Objective of the Study

The main objective of the study was to examine the influence of teamwork on employees' performance in selected firms in Anambra State. But more specifically, the study will examine the following:

- The effect of teamwork on individual employee's performance in an organization;
- The extent to which esprit de corps among the team members can affect individual member's performance;
- Whether the interpersonal relationship manifested in teamwork can impact positively on the employee's performance; and
- The extent to which reward and recognition can influence employee's performance.

1.3 Significance of the Study

Given the fact that this study is timely because organizations have been yearning for innovation that will enable them enhance productivity, minimize cost and maximize profit, the findings will be significant to all stakeholders in the organization.

- The result of the study will be of great benefit to the management of organizations that it will afford them the opportunity of seeing how teamwork operates and the benefit derivable from it.
- The findings of this study will also be beneficial to the employees of various organizations, especially the manufacturing firms, in that they will strengthen their zeal in the process.
- Teamwork and other factors affecting it have been found to be positively related to the employee's performance, this will be a source of encouragement to a wide range of employees especially those who are yet to introduce teamwork in their organizations.
- The results and findings of this study will further open up the need for research in this area

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

- To what extent can teamwork, enhance individual employee's performance in an organization?
- How does esprit de corps contribute to the individual employee's performance in an organization?
- To what extent can interpersonal relationship manifested in team trust, influence employee's performance?
- How do reward and recognition contribute to an employee's performance in an organization?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were constructed to verify the relationship between teamwork and employee's performance in an organization:

- There is no significant relationship between teamwork and employee's performance.
- There is no significant positive relationship between esprit de corps among the employees and individual employee's performance.
- Interpersonal relationship manifested in team trust does not positively affect employee's performance.
- Employee's reward and recognition do not have significant positive effects on the employee's performance.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study was designed to collect responses from the employees of selected manufacturing firms in Anambra State with a view to assessing their perceptions on the impact of teamwork on their performance. Specifically, concentration was on the influence of esprit de corps, team trust, and reward and recognition of the employees not only by the management but also by the colleagues.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this section efforts were made to review related works in this area of study so that adequate comparisons may be made with the findings of the present study with the aim of perhaps, upholding the relevant ones. However, the review was carried out under the following sub-headings: Teamwork and employee's performance, esprit de corps, team trust, and recognition and rewards.

2.1 Teamwork and Employee Performance in an Organization

According to Cohen and Bailey (1999), an employee team is a collection of individuals who are interdependent in the task and who share responsibility for the outcomes. The team enables people to cooperate, enhance individual skills and provide constructive feedback without any conflict between individuals (Jones et al; 2007). Teamwork has been described as an important factor for smooth functioning of an organization. Most of the organizational activities become complex due to advancement in technology, therefore teamwork is a major focus of many organizations. One research work concluded that teamwork is necessary for all types of organization, including non-profit

organizations (Pfaff and Huddleston, 2003). Team members enhance the skills, knowledge and abilities while working in teams (Froebel and Marchington, 2005).

The work performance or productivity of the team is higher than individual performance when the work requires a broader scope of knowledge, judgment and opinion. The advantage of teamwork is significant productivity growth in the spheres that require creative solving of different tasks, a high degree of adaptability and operational management (Totterdill, Dhondt and Milesome, 2002). Teamwork also creates an environment that facilitates knowledge and information exchange and so-called knowledge-sharing. Other advantages are the ability of new forms of work organization to increase the potential for innovation that may add value to products or services, moving them into less price-sensitive markets. Moreover, the ability of new forms of work organization to increase the employability of workers through multiskilling and the acquisition of higher competencies in problem solving, communication and teamworking will help labour market adaptation and also support new form of local and regional economic growth and regeneration (OECD,2002).

Organizations which emphasize more on teams have resulted in increased employee performance, greater productivity and better problem solving at work (Cohen and Bailey, 1999). A study has revealed that to teach individuals on how to work in teams is not an easy task because to teach individuals regarding to work in teams is inappropriate (Crosby, 1991). Bacon and Blyton (2006) highlighted the two important factors i.e. self-managed team and interpersonal team skills. These factors enhance the communication as well as interpersonal relationship between team members and also boost the employee performance. Teamwork is a significant tool of a new type of work management. Teamwork is a precise organizational measure that shows many different features in all types of organizations, including non-profit (Mulika, 2010).

In a related development, Ingram (2000) observed that the good manager is the one who assigns the responsibilities to his/her employees in a form of group or team in order to take maximum output from employees, but to Washer (2006), it should be possible to design a system of team building within every organization for employees in order to promote and distribute best practice and maximize output. The main emphasis in designing and implementing such a system according to him is ultimately to improve employee learning.

Ingram (2000) notes again that teamwork is a strategy that has a potential to improve the performance of individuals and organizations, but it needs to be nurtured over time. Organizations need to look at strategies for improving performance in the light of increasing competitive environments. He stressed that top managers need to have vision to introduce teamwork activities within the organizations, the sensitivity to nourish it and the courage to permit teams to play an important part in decision making. Conti and Kleiner (2003) took it to another level as they reported that teams offer greater participation, challenges and feelings of accomplishments. They observed that organizations with teams will attract and retain the best people, which will in turn create a high performance organization that is flexible, efficient and most importantly, profitable. Profitability is the key factor that will allow the organization to continue to compete successfully in a tough, competitive and global business arena, they concluded.

2.2 Effect of Esprit de Corps on Employee Performance

Jaworski and Kohli (2007) had emphasized that esprit de corps is the feeling and viewpoint that employees hold about the group. They observed further that it is also known as team spirit in which employees share their problem with each other within the organization. Other opinions have it that teams are prepared by groups of people who jointly depended on one another in order to achieve team objectives. Team spirit is

composed of group members' feelings, beliefs, and values. Additionally, team spirit in the organization is the key to achieve a common goal of the team (Boyt, Lusch and Mejza, 2005). The Esprit de corps is the key for success in the organization (William, Swe-Lim and Cesar, 2005). Homburg, Workman and Jansen (2002) sees esprit de corps as a valuable asset for team members as well as an organization. They stressed also that there is a positive correlation existing between esprit de corps and employee job satisfaction level. Again, others had suggested that increase in team spirit will result in better employee performance. (Boyt, Lusch and Naylor, 2001). On the other hand, other opinions are that esprit de corps has been negatively recognized by physicians in Korean hospitals (Hwang and Chang, 2009). In Pakistan, the concept of esprit de corps is not much popular. Most of the employees pursue their individual tasks rather than group (Trimizi and Shahzad, 2009).

2.3 Effect of Interdependence (Team Trust) on Employee Performance

Interdependence promotes interaction among team members. Trust among team members comes when members of the team develop the confidence in each other's competence. A study by Erdem and Ozen (2003) found that trust among the team members develop the unique skills and coordination of individuals. According to Mickan and Rodger (2000), there is positive relationship between the team performance and trust. Trust generates the behavior basis of teamwork, which results in organizational synergy and better performance of an employee.

Development of trust within the organization is the responsibility of individuals. Creation of conducive and trustable environment for synergetic team work is the responsibility of organization. Organization should transform the trustworthy behavior for measurement into performance appraised system to promote the organizational values (Erdem et al, 2003). According to Manz and Neck (2002), high performance teams within the organization exist when there is cooperation and unity between members. Reducing mistakes, quality outputs, increase in productivity and customer satisfaction are the variety of criteria through which the performance of the team is evaluated (Mickan and Rodger, 2000). Cooperation of team members can only be created when the trust comes to be most important values of the team culture. Trust provides an atmosphere for the team members where members can discuss their mistakes, accept criticism and freely express their feelings so this leads to more synergy (Edmondson, 1999).

2.4 Impact of Recognition and Reward on Employee performance

Many surveys conducted to test Herzberg's two-factor theory supported his claim that the number one motivator is not money, but a sense of achievement and recognition for a job-well-done (Idemobi, 2010). Most organization review an employee's performance only once a year and allocate praises at each time. To inspire and motivate employees to perform at their highest level of capability, managers must recognize their achievements and progress more than once a year. In the National Survey of the Changing Workforce, conducted with the families and Institute in New York, salary ranked 16th on the list of items considered very important in rating job. A recent study identified lack of enough praise and recognition as the primary reason employees leave their jobs (Kidder in Idemobi, 2010).

According to Rabey (2003), recognition and rewards are the primary focus of the individuals who are working in teams. To this end, perceptive managers know and constantly capture the benefits of the team. Teams show the collective strength of the individuals and boost the motivation and morale of individuals as well. Managers critically observe the team member's hidden working potential otherwise managers may lose them. According to Stanforth (2000), teamwork is the collective way of working which results in

potential benefits and greater synergy. Managers must plan and design an appropriate reward system for the employee and encourage their participation in team projects. They must also set the group goals which are connected towards the company strategic plan, building of employee performance and fair payment methods. After implementation of above captioned concern, managers are able to establish their teams.

Musselwhite (2001) had noted that periodically, monitoring the teamwork activities in order to check its effectiveness should be the primary focus of every business strategy. Anderson & West (2002) further argued that effective organizational environment is one in which employee communicate, participate and work in trustable atmosphere. Other research results had further suggested that teamwork is a fragile process which needs to be handled carefully in a supportive organizational environment. According to Herzberg (1987), reward and recognition can provide both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Herzberg (1968) reported that extrinsic rewards are the main factors to provide employee movement in a positive manner. According to Dunford (1992), recognition and rewards improve employee performance.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section discusses the method adopted in carrying out this study. It covered such areas as model specification, data source, the variables, the population of the study, instrumentation questionnaire, the sample and sampling technique, reliability and validity of the instrument, method of data collection and analysis.

3.1 Research Design

The study was designed as a quantitative research technique. It was conducted to investigate the effect of teamwork on employee performance. As a survey design which combined both descriptive and analytical procedures, efforts were made to ensure that the results were good enough to infer for the entire population of interest. According to Ikeagwu (1997), studies of this nature use the survey method to look for information on facts, attitudes, practices and opinions of the respondents. Obikeze (1990) and Cochran (1992) clearly stated that surveys have to do with the use of a selected sample of the population in a study and use of questionnaire as the instrument for data collection is common with survey studies.

3.2 Population of the Study

The population of the study comprised 171 senior and middle staff from three manufacturing firms at Onitsha, 125 of the same categories from two firms at Nnewi and 121 from two firms also at Awka all in Anambra State. Altogether, the total of population of interest came up to 417 staff.

3.3 Sample and Sampling Techniques

The sample size of this study was determined through the application of Taro Yemani's formula for estimating sample size from a finite population of interest.

3.4 Instrument for Data Collection

An item structured instrument was designed for collecting the data. The design reflected a five(5) modified Likert Scale of strongly agree(SA) – 5points; agree (A) – 4points; disagree (d)- 3points; strongly disagree(SD) – 2points and undecided (UND) -

1point. The statement of the items covered four main areas of the study represented by the following: teamwork, esprit de corps, trust, and recognition and rewards.

3.5 Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

The instrument was validated by issuing some copies to experts in questionnaires drafting to comment on them. In terms of the reliability, test re-test method was used to ascertain the reliability of the instrument. Some copies of the instrument were administered to 25 employees outside the sample and after an interval of two weeks, the instrument was administered to them again. Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was applied in the analysis of their responses and the average coefficient of 0.87 was estimated thus, meaning that the instrument is 87% reliable which was considered adequate for the study.

3.6 Method of Data Collection

The approach used in collecting the data was direct method. This was decided upon due to the fact that it reduces the rate of non response which often associates with surveys of this nature. The researcher and research assistant who had been trained for the purpose administered the questionnaire to the respondents and out of the 204 copies that were distributed, 191 were completed and returned thus showing a response rate of 94%. The implication of this is that any result arising from the analysis of data collected from the study can confidently be used to generalize to the entire population of interest.

3.7 Method of Data Analysis

The data collected for the study was uploaded on the computer in SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 16.0 software and normality of data was calculated. When the data were transformed and got normal, different statistical test such as correlation and regression were applied to the data for analysis. This was done to determine the degree of association between teamwork and employee performance.

3.8 Model Specification

This study is on the impact of teamwork on the employee's performance in an organization. The model of the multiple regression is thus specified as follows:

$$EP = F(TW, EDC, TT, RR) \text{ -----(1)}$$

specifying econometrically;

$$EP = \beta_0 + \beta_1TW + \beta_2EDC + \beta_3TT + \beta_4RR + \epsilon \text{ ----- (2)}$$

Where :

EP = Employee Performance

TW = Teamwork

EDC = Esprit de Corps

TT = Team Trust

RR = Rewards and Recognition

The expected signs of the coefficients (a priori) are:

$$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \text{ and } \beta_4 > 0 \text{ or } \beta_i's > 0.$$

β_0 is a constant while

β_i 's are coefficients whose magnitude and signs explain the relationship between the dependent variable, employee performance (EP) and the independent variables: teamwork(TW), esprit de corps (EDC), team trust (TT) and rewards and recognition(RR).

4. PRESENTATION OF DATA, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The study has used SPSS version 16.0 software to analysis the collected data. First, the descriptive statistics of correlation were calculated and then the regression analysis, which was used to verify the hypothesis.

4.1 Correlation Analysis

The researcher applied Pearson correlation analysis in estimating the degree of association between employee performance and teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust and recognition and rewards.

Table1: Correlation Matrix

	Team work	Employee performance	Espirit de corps	Team trust	Rewards & Recognition
Teamwork	1	**	**	**	**
Pearson		0.827	0.625	0.813	0.539
Correlation	191	0	0	0	0
Sig.(2-tailed) N		191	191	191	191
Employee performance	**	1	**	**	**
Pearson	0.765		0.489	0.747	0.472
Correlation	0	191	0	0	0
Sig.(2-tailed) N	191		191	191	191
Espirit de corps	**	**	1	**	*
pearson	0.625	0.489		0.431	0.18
Correlation	0	0	191	0	0
Sig.(2-tailed) N	191	191		191	191
Team Trust	**	**	**		**
Pearson	0.813	0.747	0.531	1	0.387
Correlation	0	0	0	0	0
Sig.(2-tailed) N	191	191	191	191	191
Reward & Recognition	**	**	*	**	1
Pearson	0.539	0.472	0.18	0.387	
Correlation	0	0	0	0	191
Sig.(2-tailed) N	191	191	191	191	

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed); *Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 1 presents the correlation matrix of the employee teamwork (TW), employee performance (EP), esprit de Corps (EDC), team trust (TT) and recognition and rewards (R&R). The analysis shows that there is positive relationship of different degrees between the variables at both 0.01 and 0.05 levels of significance. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a technique of partitioning the total variation of data into useful components which provide a means of measuring different sources of variation. The quantity used in determining the value of 'F' follows a distribution known as the F-distribution with K-1 and K (r-1) degree of freedom.

Table 2: Model summary (1) of employee performance, teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust and reward and recognition.

Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Regression	248.926	4	62.231	113.768	0.000
Residual	101.760	186	0.547		
Total	350.686	190			

a. Predictors: (constant), Rewards & Recognition, Esprit de Corps, Team Trust and Teamwork. b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance.

Now, the F value is 133.786 and is significant because the significance level is 0.000 which is less than $P \leq 0.05$. The implication of this is that the overall regression model is statistically significant, valid and fit. Furthermore, this result shows that all the independent or explanatory variables have a positive and significant relationship with the dependent variable.

4.2 Regression Analysis

Table 3: Model Summary (2)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R square	Standard error of the estimate
1	0.831 ^a	0.701	0.722	0.71114

a. Predictors: (constant), Rewards & Recognition, Esprit de corps, Team Trust, Teamwork.

Regression coefficient 'R' = 0.831 shows that 81.3% relationship exists between the independent variables (I.Vs) and the dependent variable (D.V). The coefficient of determination 'R²' = 0.701 shows that 72.2% of the variation in employee's performance is explained by teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust, and reward & recognition.

Table 4 : Summary of Coefficients: teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust, rewards & recognition and employee performance.

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized coefficient	t	Sig.
	B	Std.error	Beta		
1 (constant)	-	0.211		-0.854	-0.385
Teamwork	0.732	0.049	0.611	10.485	0.000
Esprit de corps	0.610	0.038	0.150	4.586	0.000
Team Trust	0.171	0.056	0.144	3.095	0.003
Rewards & Recognition	0.159	0.067	0.109	1.843	0.050

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance; $P < 0.05$

The analysis in Table 4 is a necessary and sufficient condition for the verification of the hypotheses set for this study. The hypotheses were outlined and concluded as follows:

Hypothesis I:

Hypothesis I, sought to determine whether there is any significant relationship between employee's performance and teamwork in an organization. Accordingly the null and alternative hypotheses were set as follows:

H₀: There is no significant relationship between employee's performance and teamwork in an organization.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between employee's performance and teamwork in an organization.

To test the hypotheses, the results in Table 4 were used. It could be seen from the table that the regression coefficient for teamwork of the employee (β_1) = 0.611 which

implies that a one percent increase in employee teamwork increases 61.1 percent in employee performance level if other variables are held constant. The t value is 10.485 which is significant at 0.000 because significant level is less than $P \leq 0.05$. It implies that the alternative hypothesis of teamwork, having a significant relationship with employee performance was accepted.

Hypothesis II:

Hypothesis II was formulated to verify whether there is any significant relationship between esprit de corps of the employee and employee's performance in an organization. Accordingly, the null and alternative hypotheses were set and concluded as follows:

H₀: There is no significant relationship between esprit de corps of the employees and employee's performance in an organization.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between esprit de corps of the employee and employee's performance in an organization.

To test the hypothesis, the results in Table 4 were used. The results showed that the regression coefficient of (β_2) = 0.150 which implies that a one percent increase in esprit de corps of employees brings on the average 15% in an employee's performance level if other variables are held constant. The t value is 4.586 and this is significant at 0.000 level, which is less than the $P \leq 0.05$. It implies therefore, that the null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected. Thus, esprit de corps has a positive significant effect on the employee's performance in an organization.

Hypothesis III:

Hypothesis attempted to establish whether there is any significant relationship between team trust and employee's performance in an organization. Accordingly, the null and alternative hypotheses were stated and concluded as follows:

H₀: There is no significant relationship between team trust and employee's performance in an organization.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between team trust and employee performance in an organization.

To test the hypothesis, the results in table 4 provides the necessary information for decision taking on the hypothesis. The result shows that the regression coefficient for team trust of the employees (β_3) is 0.144. This means that a one percent increase in team trust increases employee's performance by 14.4% if other variables are held constant. The t value is 3.095 and this is significant at 0.003. On the strength of this therefore, the study accepted the alternative hypothesis which suggests that there is a significant relationship between team trust of the employees and employee's performance in an organization.

Hypothesis IV:

Hypothesis IV sought to determine the influence of rewards and recognition of an employee in an organization on the employee's performance. Accordingly, the null and alternative hypothesis were outlined and concluded as follows:

H₀: There is no significant relationship between rewards and recognition of an employee and employee's performance in an organization.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between rewards and recognition of an employee and employee's performance in an organization.

The results of the regression analysis presented in Table 4 provided the necessary information for verifying the above claims. As could be seen from the table, the regression coefficient for employee rewards and recognition of an employee (β_4) is 0.109. The implication of this is that a one percent increase in employee rewards and recognition increases employee's performance by 10.9% when other variables are held constant. Also, the t value is 1.843 which is marginally significant at 0.05 level. On the basis of this once again, the alternative hypothesis which suggests that rewards and recognition of the employee increases his/her performance was accepted.

Table 5: Multicollinearity Diagnostic between Dependent and Independent Variables.

Variables	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)		
Teamwork	0.441	2.166
Esprit de Corps	0.820	1.228
Team Trust	0.483	2.141
Rewards & Recognition	0.795	1.363

As could be seen from the table on multicollinearity statistics, no tolerance value was less than 0.20 or 0.10 which means that there is no multicollinearity problem in the data (O'Brien and Robert, 2007). The tolerance values of the independent variables are 0.441, 0.820, 0.483 and 0.795. The reciprocal of the tolerance level is known as the variance inflation factor (VIF). According to O'Brien and Robert (2007), VIF of 5 or 10 and above is an indication that there is a multicollinearity problem in the data. From the analysis on the table, the values of independent variables are 2.166, 1.228, 2.141, and 1.363 thus showing that it does not contain the multicollinearity problem.

Table 6: Eigen values, Condition Index and Variance Proportions

Model	Eigen value	Condition Index		Variance Proportion			
			Constant	TW	EDC	TT	R&R
1	4.615	1.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	0.108	6.586	0.12	0.09	0.17	0.40	0.03
3	0.093	7.157	0.03	0.02	0.45	0.02	0.49
4	0.049	9.889	0.78	0.17	0.19	0.24	0.32
5	0.038	10.235	0.29	0.77	0.26	0.49	0.20

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance.

The Eigenvalues in Table 6 that are close to zero indicate that there are little variance among the variables. The condition index summarizes the findings and any value more than 15 is an indication that there is multicollinearity problem while a condition index of over 39 suggests serious multicollinearity problem. In the above table, values of condition index are in the range of 1.000 to 10.235 which also shows there is little or no multicollinearity issue between the dependent and independent variables.

5. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Discussion

This study examined the relationship between teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust and reward & recognition, and employee's performance in an organization. The study was designed to make use of quantitative techniques in the analysis. Literature review was quite extensive, touching previous works which have investigated the phenomenon or related areas. Major findings of the study include the positive and strong relationship between team work, rewards & recognition of the employees, team trust and esprit de corps and

employee's performance in an organization. The implication of this is that managers should focus more on team arrangement because it has clearly shown that it has the capacity to increase employee performance and by extension, the productivity by a large ratio.

Recognition & rewards are the main focus of the individuals who are working in teams. Also, team spirit as reflected in esprit de corps and team trust was found to be very critical in improving employee's performance and it is the key to achieving the common goal of the team. Furthermore, the overall regression value for all the independent variables was 0.831 which was interpreted to mean 83.1% impact of independent variables on dependent variables-employee's performance in the organization. From the descriptive statistics, it was found that all the independent variables; teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust, rewards and recognition were all positively correlated. Better organizational performance, competitive advantage and increased product quality and quantity could be achieved from team work.

5.2 Conclusion

Employers may be able to improve their performance by increasing the volume of team work and taking action to raise the performance level of the individual, but to succeed in this, they also need to pay attention to the quantity and type of team work offered. Teamwork activity within the organization is very much beneficial and its effect directly bears on the employee's performance. When an employee acquires adequate opportunities for teamwork, his/her performance automatically improves and it is also accompanied by job satisfaction. Teamwork ensures that skills are better utilized because there is an inbuilt mechanism for learning within the team. This implies that the tendency or propensity to quit the job would drastically be reduced. Teamwork ensures that individual output is far greater than what it would have been without a group arrangement (Frobel and Marchington, 2005).

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion of this study, the following recommendations were made:

- In organizations, especially in manufacturing firms where production lines can easily be identified, policies that support team efforts inside the organizations should be promoted to enable the employees function optimally as the findings of this study have revealed.
- Employers should develop an atmosphere where employees are well satisfied with their job and in perfect relationship with team mates. In this way, the employees will be in a position to utilize their full potential in their jobs.
- Organizations should endeavour to allow the employees' freedom of decision regarding the procedure to adopt in the course of executing their assignments, and this way they would have the necessary flexibility required to be more productive.
- Managers must plan and design an appropriate reward system for the employees and encourage their participation in team arrangements to facilitate the realization of the company's objective.

REFERENCES

- Alie, R.E., Beam, H. & Carey, T.A. (1998). The use of Teams in an undergraduate management Programme. *Journal of management Education*, 22 (6), 707-19.
- Anderson, N. and West, M. (2002). The personality of teamworking. *Journal of personal Management*, 4(3), 81.

- Bacon, N. & Blyton, P. (2006). Union co-operation in a context of Job security: Negotiated Outcomes from Team Working. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44(2); 215-23.
- Boyt, T., Lusch, R.F. & Naylor, G. (2001). The role of professionalism in determining job satisfaction in Professional services: A study of Marketing Researchers. *Journal of Service Research*, 3(4): 321-330.
- Cochran, W.G. (1997). *Sampling Techniques*, New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Cohen, S.G. & Bailey, D.E. (1999). What Makes Teams Work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 239—90.
- Conti, B. and Kleiner, B. (2003). How to Increase Teamwork in Organizations. *Journal of Quality*. 5(1): 26-29.
- Crosby, B. (1991). *Strategic Planning and Strategic Management: what Are They and How Are They Different?* Technical Note, No.1. Published by the Implementing Policy Change Project Management System International, Inc., for the US Agency for International development.
- Delarue, A. & De Paris, P. (2004). Teamwork in Vlaanderen: Universele Praktijk of selectief Principle, in Van Hootegem. And Cambre, B; overwork, Leuven. Acco.pp.116-136.
- Dunford, R.W. (1992). *Organizational Behaviour: An organization analysis perspective*, Addison-Wesley business series, Sydney.
- Edmondson, A.C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behaviour in work teams. *Admin Science-Quart*. 44(2): 350-383.
- Erdem, F. & Ozen, J. (2003). Cognitive and affective dimensions of trust in developing team Performance. *Team performance management; An International Journal*, 9(6): 131-135.
- Frobel, P. & Marchington, M. (2005). Teamwork structures and worker's perception: A cross national study in pharmaceuticals. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(2): 256-276.
- Harris, P.R. & Harris, K.G. (1995). Managing effectively through teams. *Team performance management: An International Journal*, 2(3), 23-36.
- Harteniam, L.S. (2003). Team members acquisition of team knowledge, skills and abilities. *Journal of Team Performance Management*, 9(1/2), 23-30.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: World publications.
- Hwang, J.I. & Chang, H. (2009). Work climate perception and turn over intention among Korean hospital staff. *International Nursing Review*, 56.
- Idemobi, E.I. (2010). *Theory and Practice of Management*. Enugu: Gostak printing and publishers. Co Ltd.
- Ikeagwu, K.I. (1998). *Groundwork of research methods and procedure*. 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.
- Jaworsky, B. & Kohli, A. (1993). Marketing orientation: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing*. 57: 53-70.
- Jones, A, Richard, A., Paul, D., Sloane, K., and Peter, F. (2007). Effectiveness of teambuilding in organization. *Journal of management*, 5(3), 35-37.
- Manz, C. & Neck, S. (2002). Teamthink: Beyond the group think syndrome in self-managing work teams. *Journal of Team Performance Management*, 3(1):18-31.
- Mickan, S. & Rodger, S. (2000). The organizational context for teamwork: Comparing health care and business literature. *Australian Health Review*, 23(1): 179-192.
- Mulike, S. (2010). The Impact of teamwork on employee performance in strategic management and the performance improvement department of Abu Dhabi Police, UAE.
- Musselwhite, C. (2001). Knowledge, pay and performance. *Journal of Training and Development* 42(1): 62-70.
- Obikeze, D.S. (1990). *Methods of Data Analysis*, Enugu: Auto-century publication.

- O'leary-Kelly, A.M., Martocchio, J.J & Frink, D.D. (1994). A review of the influence of group goals on group performance. *Academy of management journal*, Vol 37, No 4: PP 1285-1307
- Organization for economic cooperation and development (OECD) (2002). *Education at a glance: OECD Indicators*. Education and skills paris: OECD.
- Pexova; L.(2010). *Tymova prace v malych firmach*, masters thesis, Charles University, Prague
- Ptaff, E. & Huddleston, P.(2003). Does it matter if I hate teamwork? What impacts student's attitudes towards teamwork. *Journal of marketing education* 25: 37-45.
- Rabey, G.(2003). The paradox of teamwork. *Journal of industrial and commercial training*. 35(4): 158-162.
- Robbins, S.P. & Judge, T.A.(2007). *Organizational behavior*, Twelfth edition. New Jersey: Pearson educational Inc.
- Staniforth, D.(2000). Teamworking or individual working in teams. *Journal of team performance Management*. 2(3): 37-41
- Tirmizi, M.A & Shazad, M.H.S.(2009). Is it industry productive: A performance base investigation of IT sector firms, operating in Pakistan?. *International journal of business management* 4(5).
- Totterdill, P., Dhotti, S. & Milsome, S.(2002), *Partners at work?. A report to Europe's policymakers and social partners; Report of the European commission, DG research Hi-Res project.*
- Washer, P. (2006). Designing a system for observation of teaching. *Journal of quality assurance in education*. 14(3): 243-250.
- William, D.R., Swee-lim F. Cesar, M. (2005). Job insecurity spill over to key account management: Negative effects on performance, effectiveness, adaptiveness and esprit de corps. *Journal of business and psychology*, 19(4): 483-503

© 2010-2014 Sacha & Diamond Academic Publishers,
Meridian Centre, 258 Kingsland Road, Hackney, London E8 4DG, England, United Kingdom.
In Compliance with the Standards Approved by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council

Abstracting and Indexing in:
GIGA - The Electronic Journals Library of the German Institute of Global and Area Studies,
Information Centre, Hamburg; Google Scholar; Global Development Network (GDNNet);
Social Science Research Network (SSRN);
Econlit - The American Economic Association's Index; EBSCO
IndexCopernicus USA; British International Libraries; Anton's Weekly Digest;
Econlit (USA);
International Abstracts in Operations Research;
Environmental Science and Pollution Management;
Research Alert.

For the Advancement of Knowledge to the World. www.sachajournals.com