

## IMPACT OF TEAMWORK ON ORGANIZATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY IN SOME SELECTED BASIC SCHOOLS IN THE ACCRA METROPOLITAN ASSEMBLY

Dr. Sonal Agarwal<sup>1,2</sup>, Theophilus Adjirackor<sup>1,3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Data Link University College, P.O. Box 2481, Tema, Ghana

<sup>2</sup>Presbyterian University College, Community 5, Tema, Ghana

<sup>3</sup>Ghana Institute of Management and Business Administration, Accra, Ghana

<sup>4</sup>Nuclear Regulatory Authority, P.O.Box AE 50, Kwabenya, Accra, Ghana

### ABSTRACT

The study assessed the impact of teamwork on organizational productivity on the staff members of Kwashieman Anglican Basic School of the Accra Metropolitan Assembly, Omanjor M/A Basic School under the Ga-West Assembly and Ablekuma Anglican Basic School in the Ga-Central Assembly of the Greater-Accra Region. The study utilized quantitative techniques to analyze the relationship between the variables that is Teamwork, Esprit de corps (Team Spirit), team trust, recognition and rewards and organizational productivity. The study shows that there is a significant positive impact of the predictors on the response variable with an adjusted  $R^2$  of 70.5%. The study recommends that teamwork activities have to be adopted in order to enhance Organizational Productivity.

**Keywords:** Employee performance, Teamwork, Team trust, Esprit de Corps & Recognition & Rewards.

### BACKGROUND

Teamwork is the process of working collaboratively with a group of people in order to achieve a goal. The external factors of teamwork are the political, economic, social and technological factors that affect teamwork while the internal factors of teamwork constitute leadership style, diversity (culture, talent and personalities) communication, cohesiveness etc. which affects teamwork.

Teamwork is as old as mankind, and many organizations use the term teamwork in either one sense or the other, such as in the production, marketing processes, etc. Management team, production team or an entire organization can be referred as a team. Cook (1998) claimed that there is a growing consensus among scholars in the world that organizations may be getting works done through individuals, but his super achievement lies in the attainment of set goals through teams (teamwork). It is a well-known fact that teamwork is not only the foundation of all successful managements, but the means of improving overall results in organizational productivity. Wage (1997) described Teamwork as an idea of working together in a group to achieve the same goals and objectives for the good of the service users and organizations in order to deliver a good quality of service (productivity). Ruth (2007) claimed that employees' teamwork is seen as constituting a larger group of people than what job position describes. The essence of teamwork is that workload is reduced and broken into pieces of work for everyone to take part. Alan (2003) defined teamwork as a grouping of professionals whose members work intensely on a specific, common goal using their positive synergy, individual mutual accountability and complementary skills. Employees take many steps toward accomplishing key action items and nothing important is finished. Team work is the ability to work together towards a common vision. It is a fuel that allows common people to attain uncommon results.

Collective action is widely recognized as a positive force for teamwork in any organization or institution to succeed. Teams enable individuals to empower themselves and to increase benefits from cooperative work engaged on as a group. Getting together with others also can allow individuals to better understand the importance of teamwork and how the organizations operate as well as promote the culture of teamwork success.

Davis (2007) claimed that employers always stress the need for employing those (Employees) that can be able to work with a team and they (Employers) generally talk of teamwork when they want to emphasize the need to various talents possessed by different employees. The organizations however, coordinate the employees into different teams, such as management team, production team, etc.

Organization is a social unit of people that is structured and managed to meet a need or to pursue collective goals or organization is a systematic arrangement of people to accomplish the same specific purpose. Every organization is composed of three elements i.e. people, goals and system. The purpose is expressed as goals generally. Each organization has a systematic structure that defines members and some members are managers and some are operatives. Organization according Caroline (2008) is a social entity whose goal is directed, deliberately structured activity systems with a preamble boundary. Alan (2008) claimed that productivity is the rate at which an employer, company or country produces goods and the amount, produced compared with how much time, work and money is needed to produce them.

Productivity is about how well people combine resources such as raw materials, labour, skills, capital, equipment, land, intellectual property, managerial capability and financial capital to produce goods and services.

This study concentrated specifically on the use of the term teamwork which involves reshaping the way work is carried out. This includes organizing employees into teams based on a distinct product, each team performing a particular task. These teams are given a high degree of responsibility and are expected to work with flexibility. The interest of the study is to understand or know how teamwork in organization has and can contribute to the improved productivity such as Coca-Cola Bottling Company Ghana, Nestle Ghana Limited, Windows Cooperation, Apple cooperation just to mention a few. The impact of teamwork on organizational productivity involves internal and external factors that contribute to high productivity. The internal factors have to do with team norms, ground rules, interpersonal and rational skills or qualities that determines how individual's teams will function while the external factors are the organizational culture, systems and structures within which all teams perform determines the level of teamwork within an organization. Various other measures of organizational productivity are also included in the research study, which are *esprit de corps (Team Spirit), team trust, and recognition & rewards*.

## **STATEMENT OF THE ROBLEM**

Every organization, either large or small, struggles to acquire productivity so as to achieve success and maintain a valuable image in this present world of organizational competitions and it is the wish of organizations to see the input they use (resources) and the output (goods and services produced) they have at the end.

The population of workers in an organization may be very large and yet that organization achieves a very low productivity and with no improvement in their products. This could occur as a result of absence of teamwork in such organizations and if so, then there are other organizations that have teams and yet achieve little or no productivity at all. It may be as a result of the following problems:

- Lack of Teamwork in the Organization: That is the failure of an organization to coordinate works into work groups in order to tap from the respective human resources the organization possesses.
- Poor Leadership Styles in the Organization: It may be as a result of the leadership style of the organization possibly not favourable to teamwork.
- Poor Leadership of the Work Teams: Different work teams may exist, but lacks the persons with the team leading acumen to lead them.
- Lack of Motivation of the Workforce: The way in which organizations reward their workforce may also lead to low organizational productivity even when their staff work in teams.
- Prevailing Conditions that hinder growth in an Organization: The conditions permanently occurring in an organization (lack of picking-up of innovative ideas) thus, absence of designing motivational programs, educational growth, bonuses, job rotation and the use of old technologies, etc., may be the cause of low organizational productivity

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The general objective of this study is to investigate the contributions of teamwork on organizational productivity. The specific objectives of this study are as listed below:

- Determine the effect of teamwork on organizational productivity.
- Investigate the ways of leadership styles used by the organizations affect organizational productivity.
- Determine the effect of poor leadership on work team's leadership.
- Investigate the benefits of motivation to the workforce.
- Determine the prevailing conditions that hinder growth to organizational productivity.

## HYPOTHESIS

The following hypothesis were formulated for the study

H<sub>0</sub>: Teamwork has no effect on employee performance

H<sub>1</sub>: Teamwork has positive effect on employee performance

H<sub>0</sub>: Esprit de corps has no effect on employee performance

H<sub>2</sub>: Esprit de corps has positive effect on employee performance

H<sub>0</sub>: Team trust has no effect on employee performance

H<sub>3</sub>: Team trust has positive effect on employee performance

H<sub>0</sub>: Employee rewards & recognition have no effect on employee performance

H<sub>4</sub>: Employee rewards & recognition have positive effect on employee performance

## Study Population

The population for this study comprised of upper, middle and lower staff members of Kwashieman M/A School, Omanjor M/A School and Ablekuma M/A School. The total population of the study is 242 staff members which constitute 50, 62 and 40 staff respectively from Kwashieman M/A School, Omanjor M/A School and Ablekuma respectively.

## Sample and Sampling Technique

The sampling technique that was adopted for this research was non- probability quota sampling. This was achieved by grouping each school into a quota and respondents from each school was selected using non probability convenience sampling giving a sample size of 200. The total of 242 questionnaires were distributed among the staff members of the Kwashieman Anglican Basic School, Ablekuma, Anglican Basic School and Omanjor M/A Basic School located in the Accra Metro, Ga-Central and Ga-West assembly of the Greater-Accra region. In the Kwashieman Anglican Basic School, 50 questionnaires were distributed and 50 usable questionnaires were returned giving a response rate of 100%. In Omanjor M/A Basic School, a total 102 questionnaires were distributed and 84 usable questionnaires were returned giving a response rate of 82.35%. In Ablekuma, total 90 questionnaires were distributed and 66 usable questionnaires were returned giving a response rate of 73.3%.

## Data Analysis

The data collected were coded and input into a computer software called Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0 for the analysis. Both quantitative and descriptive statistics were used in the analysis. The descriptive analytical tools include the use of cross tabulation whiles the quantitative analytical tools include correlation coefficients, correlation matrix and regression equation model.

## Regression Analysis

The research study uses multiple regression analysis in order to analyze impact of independent variables on dependent variable. The general multiple regression model is given by

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \epsilon \dots (1)$$

Where Y is Employee Performance (dependent variable),  $\alpha$  is constant

X is other factors affecting Performance

$\beta$  is the regression coefficient which may positively or negatively affect the independent variables.

$$EP = \alpha + \beta_1 TW + \beta_2 EDC + \beta_3 TT + \beta_4 R\&R + \epsilon \dots (2)$$

Where EP = employee performance (dependent variable)  $\beta_1 TW$  = teamwork (I.V)  $\beta_2 EDC$  =

Esprit de corps (I.V),  $\beta_3 T\&T$  = team trust (I.V)  $\beta_4 R\&R$  = rewards and recognition (I.V).

**DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION****Data Analysis***Table 1: Age and Gender Cross Tabulation*

Age	Gender		
	Female	Male	Total
20 -28	69	13	82
29 -39	77	11	88
40 and Above	24	6	30
	<b>170</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>200</b>

The above table shows the cross tabulation of age and gender. The male and female respondents represents 30 and 170 of the total sample respectively, thus majority of the employees of the school constituting 85% of the total sample are females between the age of 29-39 years.

*Table 2: Teaching Staff Level and Gender Cross Tabulation*

Age	Gender		
	Female	Male	Total
Top	10	0	10
Medium	42	10	52
Low	118	20	138
<b>Total</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>200</b>

Table 2 shows the cross tabulation of teaching staff level of Kwashieman, Anglican Basic, Omanjor M/A Basic and Ablekuma Anglican Basic School and staff gender. The staff level comprised of ranking according to years of service by the Ghana Education Service. Top level staff are categorized as Principal Superintendent, middle level staff members as Senior Superintendent I and lower level members as Senior Superintendent II.

Top level staff members were 10 representing 5% of the total sample, medium level staff members were 52 of which 42 respondents were males and 10 females representing 26% of the total sample. Low level staff members were 138 of which 118 are males 20 females representing 69% of the total sample.

Table 3: Reliability Statistics

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
Teamwork	0.93	5
Esprit de corps	0.95	5
Team trust	0.91	5
Rewards & Recognition	0.94	5
Employee Performance	0.95	5

Inter-item reliability coefficient Cronbach's alpha for different variables is used to delete an item from questionnaires, to delete an item Cronbach's alphas have to range between 0.790 - 0.826 (Sekaran, 2003). The above reliability statistics value of the five variables shows that there is no problem of deletion of questionnaire item, which confirms the reliability of information in this study.

### Correlation Analysis

The research study finds out the Pearson correlation between employee performance and teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust and recognition and rewards.

Table 4: Correlation Matrix

		Teamwork	Employee Performance	Esprit De corps	Team Trust	Reward & Recognition
Teamwork	Pearson Correlation	1	0.819	0.427	0.710	0.439
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200
Employee Performance	Pearson Correlation	0.819	1	0.475	0.647	0.471
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200
Esprit De corps	Pearson Correlation	0.427	0.475	1	0.331	0.170
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000		0.000	0.16
	N	200	200	200	200	200

Team Trust	Pearson	0.710	0.647	0.331	1	0.337
	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200
Reward & Recognition	Pearson	0.439	0.471	0.170	0.377	1
	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.016	0.000	
	N	200	200	200	200	200

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

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 4 demonstrates the correlation matrix of the employee performance (EP), employee teamwork (TW), esprit de corps (EDC), team trust (TT) and recognition and rewards (R & R). The correlation shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between the variables, moreover there is a strong positive correlation between teamwork and organizational performance and also there is a strong positive relationship between teamwork and team trust at 0.01 and 0.05 levels of significance. It can be deduced from the relationship that even though the independent variables have a positive effect on employee performance, teamwork influences employee performance better ( $r = 0.819$ ) and also teamwork works better with team trust ( $r = 0.710$ ).

*Table 5: Table summary of coefficient of teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust, rewards and employee performance.*

Model	Unstandardized		Standardized		Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
Constants	-0.174	0.201		-0.866	0.387
Teamwork	0.615	0.059	0.620	10.494	0.000
Esprit De Corps	0.174	0.049	0.152	3.568	0.000
Team Trust	0.149	0.048	0.133	3.095	0.002
Reward and Recognition	0.111	0.057	0.107	1.941	0.050

*a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance @ 5% level of significance*

Table 5 generated the specific regression equation as

$$EP = 0.620TW + 0.152EDC + 0.133TT + 0.107R\&R + \varepsilon \dots (3)$$

In equation 3 above the regression coefficient for teamwork of the employee ( $\beta_1$ ) = 0.620 implies that one percent increase in employee teamwork increases employee performance by 62% if other variables are kept constant and its T value of 10.494 which is greater than the critical T at the 5% level of significance shows that there is enough statistical proof that an increase in teamwork will lead to an increase in employee performance and vice versa, thus the null hypothesis has to be rejected to accept the alternative hypothesis.

The regression coefficient Esprit de corps ( $\beta_2$ ) = 0.152 or 15.2 % implies that one percent in esprit de corps will lead to 15.2% increase in employee performance level if other variables are kept constant and its T value of 3.568 which is greater than the critical T at the 5% level of significance shows that there is enough statistical proof that an increase in esprit de corps will lead to an increase in employee performance and vice versa, thus the null hypothesis has to be rejected to accept the alternative hypothesis.

The regression coefficient for team trust of the employees ( $\beta_3$ ) = 0.131 or 13.1 % explains that once percent increase in team trust increases employee performance by 13.1% if other variables are kept constant and its T value of 3.095 which is greater than the critical T at the 5% level of significance shows that there is enough statistical proof that an increase in team trust will lead to an increase in employee performance and vice versa, thus the null hypothesis has to be rejected to accept the alternative hypothesis.

The regression coefficient for employee rewards & recognition of an employees ( $\beta_4$ ) = 0.107 or 10.7 % explains that one percent increase in employee rewards increases employee performance by 10.7% if other variables are kept constant and its T value of 1.941 which is greater than the critical T at the 5% level of significance shows that there is enough statistical proof that an increase in team trust will lead to an increase in employee performance and vice versa, thus the null hypothesis has to be rejected to accept the alternative hypothesis. Finally, the omission of the constant value in the regression equation shows that employee performance cannot be achieved in the study without the influence of the independent variables.

Table 6: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of Estimate
1	0.843 <sup>a</sup>	0.711	0.705	0.73264

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rewards & Recognition, Esprit De corps, Team Trust, Teamwork

Regression coefficient R = 0.843 explains that there is a strong positive relationship between the independent variables and employee performance, thus an increase in the independent variables will lead to an increase in employee performance and vice versa.

The adjusted  $R^2 = 0.705$  shows that an increase in the independent variables will increase employee performance by 70.5% and vice versa. Thus, 70.5% variation in employee performance is



explained by teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust and rewards and 29.5% could be due to other factors which were not considered in the study.

Table 7: Model summary of employee performance, teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust and rewards

ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	257.950	4	64.488	120.140	0.00 <sup>a</sup>
Residual	104.670	195	0.537		
Total	362.620	199			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rewards & Recognition, Esprit De corps, Team Trust, Teamwork

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Table 7 shows the influence of the independent variables are statistically significant at the 5% level of significance on employee performance with a calculated F value of 120.140 being greater than the theoretical F value, thus there is enough statistical evidence to conclude that the independent variables have positive and significant relationship with employee performance.

Table 8: Multicollinearity diagnostic between Dependent and Independent Variables collinearity Statistics

Variables	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)		
Teamwork	0.425	2.355
Esprit de corps	0.816	1.226
Team trust	0.490	2.041
Rewards & Recognition	0.798	1.253

The above table shows the multicollinearity statistics. The tolerance value of less than 0.20 or 0.10 indicates a multicollinearity problem (O'Brien & Robert, 2007). In the above table the tolerance values of all independent variables are 0.425, 0.816, 0.490 and 0.798 which shows that the tolerance level is moderate and good and have no problem of multicollinearity. The reciprocal of the tolerance is known as the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The VIF of 5 or 10 and above indicates a multicollinearity problem (O'Brien & Robert, 2007). In the above table VIF values of independent variables are 2.355, 1.226, 2.0411 and 1.253 which shows that the VIF level have no problem of multicollinearity, thus independent variables have no influence on each other and does not affect or influence the outcome of employee performance in the study.

Table 9 Eigen values and Variance proportions for Independent variables

Model	Eigen Value	Condition Index		Variance Proportions			
			Constant	TW	EDC	TT	R&R
1	4.714	1.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	0.109	6.575	0.11	0.08	0.19	0.30	0.02
3	0.092	7.146	0.02	0.01	0.43	0.01	0.49
4	0.047	9.979	0.68	0.15	0.17	0.21	0.30
5	0.037	11.224	0.19	0.76	0.20	0.48	0.18

Eigen values close to 0 indicate dimensions which explain little variance. In above table Eigen values of 0.109, 0.092, 0.047 and 0.037 are close to zero which shows little variance in these variables. The condition index summarizes findings thus, a condition index over 15 indicate a possible multicollinearity problem and a condition index over 30 suggests a serious multicollinearity problem. In above table values of condition index are in range of 1.00 to 11.224 which shows that there is very little multicollinearity issue between independent variables which confirms the genuine influence of the independent variables on employee performance.

## DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Discussion

This study examines the relationship of teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust, recognition and rewards and employee performance. Hypothesis one states that teamwork has positive effect on employee performance and was found significant in this study. The result of hypothesis one is consistent with previous study of (Cohen & Manion, 1999; Frobel & Marchington, 2005) which stated that those organizations which focus more on teams have results in increased employee performance and greater productivity.

Hypothesis two states that esprit de corps has positive effect on employee performance and was found to be significant. The result of the hypothesis two is consistent with the study of (Lusch & Naylor, 2001; Boyt, Lusch & Mejza, 2005) which stated that team spirit will result in better employee performance and contributes in organizations achieving a common goal.

Hypothesis three states that team trust has positive effect on employee performance and was also found to be significant and strongly correlated with teamwork in achieving organizational productivity. This finding also is in view with (Mickan & Rodger, 2000; Manz & Neck, 2002).

Hypothesis four states that employee rewards & recognition has significant positive effect on employee performance and found to be significant in this study. This result is supported by the (Rabey, 2003) which states that recognition and rewards are the main focus of the individuals who are working in teams.

## Conclusion

The research shows a strong positive significant relationship between the independent variables namely teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust, recognition & rewards and employee performance. However, teamwork was highly correlated with employee performance. The results show that an increase in teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust, recognition & rewards will contribute to a 70.5% increase organizational productivity and 29.5% may be due to other factors that was not considered in this study. The independent variables thus teamwork, esprit de corps, team trust, recognition & rewards influenced employee performance by 62%, 15.2%, 13.3% and 10.7% respectively. The overall results revealed that teamwork which brings benefits in terms of higher productivity, better organizational performance, competitive advantage and increased product quality and quantity highly contributes to organizational productivity compared to other factors.

Employers may be able to improve their performance by increasing the volume of teamwork and taking action to raise the performance level of the individual, but to succeed in this they need to pay attention to the quantity and type of teamwork offered. Teamwork activity within the organization is very much beneficial and its effect is directly on employee performance. When an employee acquires adequate opportunities of teamwork his/her performance automatically improves and he/she will be satisfied with the job and this could ensure that skills are better utilized. This might reduce the possibility of an employee quitting a job.

## REFERENCES

- Alie, R. E., Beam, H., and Carey, T. A. (1998). The use of teams in an undergraduate management program. *Journal of Management Education*, 22(6), 707-19.
- Anderson, N., and West, M. (2002). The personality of team working. *Journal of Personal Management*, 4(3), 81.
- Bacon, N., and Blyton, P. (2006). Union co-operation in a context of job insecurity: Negotiated outcomes from team working. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44(2), 215-23.
- Boyt, T., Lusch, R., and Mejza, M. (2005). Theoretical Model of the Antecedents and consequences of organizational, workgroup and Professional esprit de Corps. *European Management Journal*, 23(6), 682-701
- Boyt, T., Lusch, R. F., and 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.
- Cohen, S.G., and 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 Assurance in Education*, 14(3), 243-250. , 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 Systems International, Inc., for the US Agency for International Development.

- De Beer, M.J. (1987). 'n Ondersoek na die rol wat arbeidsomset in die bedryf speel met spesifieke verwysing nawerkbevrediging en werksmotivering.
- Dunford, R. W. (1992). *Organisational Behaviour: An Organisational Analysis Perspective*, Addison-Wesley Business Series, Sydney.
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 44(2) 350-383.
- Erdem, Ferda, Ozen and Janset. (2003). Cognitive and Affective Dimensions of Trust in Developing Team Performance. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 9(5.6) 131-135.
- Froebel, P., and Marchington, M. (2005). Teamwork structures and worker perception: a cross national study in pharmaceuticals, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(2), 256-276.
- Hartenian, L.S. (2003), Team member acquisition of team knowledge, skills, and abilities. *Journal of Team Performance Management*, 9(1/2), 23-30.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, 53-63.
- Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, September-October, 109-20.
- Homburg, C., Workman, J. P. Jr., and Jensen, O. (2002). A configurational perspective on key account management. *Journal of Marketing*, 66, 38-60.
- Hwang, J.I., and Chang, H. (2009). Work climate perception and turn over intention among Korean Hospital Staff. *International Nursing Review*, 56.
- Ingram, H. (2000). Linking teamwork with performance. *Journal of Team Performance Management*, 2(4), 5-10.
- Jaworsky, B., and Kohli, A. (1993). Marketing orientation: antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing*, 57: 53-70.
- Jones, A., Richard, B., Paul, D., Sloane K., and Peter, F. (2007). Effectiveness of teambuilding in organization. *Journal of Management*, 5(3), 35-37.
- Manz, C., and Neck, S. (2002). Team think: 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.
- Mulika. (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.
- O'Brien, Robert M. (2007). A Caution Regarding Rules of Thumb for Variance Inflation Factors," *Quality and Quantity* 41(5), 673-690.
- Pfaff, E., and P. Huddleston. (2003). Does it matter if I hate teamwork? What impacts student attitudes toward 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.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). "Research methods for business: A skill-building approach." USA, John Wiley & Sons.
- Staniforth, D. (2000). Team working, or individual working in a 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).
- 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, C., and 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.